ROYAL LIFE & MANNERS

BY LUDWIG FRIEDLÄNDER

TRANSLATED BY J. H. FREESE

913.37
F913
v.3

LIBRARY
SAN RAFAEL

DG78 .F7413 1908
vol.3
Friedlaender, Ludwig,
1824-1909.
Roman life and manners under
the early empire

DOMINICAN COLLEGE
LIBRARY
SAN RAFAEL, CALIF.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_W9-CUG-613_3

ROMAN LIFE AND MANNERS UNDER THE EARLY EMPIRE

A Supplementary Volume, containing the NOTES and EXCURSUSES omitted from the seventh (popular) German edition, translated by Mr. J. H. Freese, will be published in 1910.

ROMAN LIFE AND MANNERS UNDER THE EARLY EMPIRE

By

LUDWIG FRIEDLÄNDER

Authorized Translation of the Seventh Enlarged and Revised Edition of the *Sittengeschichte Roms*

by

J. H. FREESE, M.A. (Camb.)

(In Three Volumes)

Volume III

WITH AN INDEX TO THE THREE VOLUMES

DOMINICAN COLLEGE LIBRARY SAN RAFAEL, CALIF.

LONDON

GEORGE ROUTLEDGE & SONS, LIMITED

NEW YORK: E. P. DUTTON & CO.

913.37
F913
v.3

23883

Made in Great Britain.

CONTENTS

CHAP. PAGE

I BELLES-LETTRES: POETRY AND ARTISTIC PROSE. 1–83

Effects of the system of education. Its chief aim eloquence. Care of the state and communes for instruction in eloquence. The first course consisted of reading and elucidation of the poets. Greek and Roman poets read at school; in the first century chiefly living poets. Reaction against modern literature. The old poets introduced into the schools. Fronto. Aulus Gellius. Archaic poetry in the second century. Effects of the study of the poets. Teachers often themselves poets. Precocious poets numerous. Improvisation. Rhetorical schools. Pupils' written exercises. Declamations. *Suasoriae. Controversiae.* Romantic themes. Tyrants and pirates as subjects. These subjects used in the *Gesta Romanorum.* Magicians in *controversiae.* Greek rhetorical schools. Effects of the rhetorical schools. The rhetorical colouring of poetry, and the poetical colouring of prose. Decrease of school education and decay of language in the second century. Attempts to restore its purity. *Effects of the classical poetry of the Augustan age.* Its importance. Creation and spread of a poetical language. Popularity of Virgil and other classical poets. Poetical dilettantism the result of classical poetry. *Effects of the monarchy.* Parallels from the literature of the early empire. Imperial interest in poetry and literature. Augustus. Maecenas. Tiberius. Nero. Titus. Domitian. Nerva. Hadrian. Disappearance of poetical dilettantism from the court in the second century. Reasons of this phenomenon. Results of the revived importance of poetry and literature. Rise of the book trade. Writing and printing compared. Prices of books. Foundation of public libraries. Introduction

CHAP. PAGE

I of recitations. Great increase in their number. How the reciters presented themselves. Expressions of approval. The younger Pliny on recitations. Emperors present. Readings in the Middle Ages and modern times. Crowning of poets (especially the Capitoline). Quintus Sulpicius Maximus. Poets crowned in the Middle Ages. Domitian's Alban competition. Precarious livelihood of poets. Juvenal's description. Their dependence on the generosity of the rich and great. Mutual advantages of this state of things. Imperial generosity to poets. Augustus. The later emperors. Generosity of great men. Maecenas. His relations with Horace. Later poets no more than 'clients' of their patrons. The panegyrics on Messalla and Piso. Worse position of poets in Nero's time. Martial's efforts to obtain patrons at court, amongst the aristocracy, amongst the knights. Patrons of Statius. Poverty of both poets. Martial's degraded attitude. Poetry as a means of social amusement. Statius's attitude more dignified. The higher occasional poetry a substitute for journalism. Large output of occasional poetry. Occasional poems of Martial and Statius on the same subjects. Disagreement between Statius and Martial. Their mutual envy and jealousy. Over-production of poetical literature. Preponderance of (mythological) epos. Influence of Virgil. Poetical trifles. Poetry mostly reproduction. Imitation of Virgil and Catullus. Poetical dilettantism of the younger Pliny. Poetical dilettantism common in the higher circles, even at an advanced age. Revolution brought about in Hadrian's time by sophistic. Greek sophistic and its effects in the Greek and Roman world. Interest taken by the emperors and the Romans generally in the sophistic art. Influence of Greek sophistic on the Roman literature of the second century. Apuleius. Importance of poetry in general education after the Renascence period. 1–83

CHAP. PAGE
II RELIGION 84–214

1. The Belief in Gods (Polytheism).

Difference between literary and monumental authorities. Literature hitherto almost exclusively utilized. Irreligious tendencies in the latest pre-Christian and earliest Christian times. Hatred of belief a rare occurrence. Lucretius. Epicureans and Sceptics. Religious views of educated Romans outside philosophical circles. Belief (Tacitus). Wavering between polytheism and monotheism (Quintilian). Absolute denial of the gods (Pliny). Reconciliation of faith and reason in Stoic theology. Restoration of belief in the second century. Development and dogmatic authority of the theory of demons. Plutarch. Apuleius. Maximus of Tyre. General impression produced by Greek and Roman literature in the second century. Lucian. The second century emperors. Characteristic phenomena of the newly awakened religious life. Aelian's intolerant orthodoxy. Fanaticism of Aristides. Undiminished strength and permanence of the popular belief. Three proofs of it. (1) *Its power of assimilation.* Adoption of elements from Oriental religions. Theocrasy a necessary effect of the intercourse of nations. The idea of superstition relative and variable. Theocrasy, only ridiculed by unbelievers, did not give offence to believers. Plutarch's reverence for Greek and Egyptian gods alike. Hellenization of oriental and barbarian gods. Spread of barbarian cults by the soldiers. Nomenclature of barbarian divinities dependent upon the extent to which individual countries were romanized. (2) *Productivity of Polytheism.* New divinities. Annona. Belief in genii. The deification of human beings. The imperial cult. The worship of the dead and living in Greece as heroes. Cult of kings under the Diadochi. Apotheosis of Antinous. (3) *Power of resistance shown by polytheism.* Its influence on Christians. Direct evidence of

CHAP. PAGE

II the undiminished vitality of the popular belief. 84–170
The belief in miracles. Appearance of the gods in person. Other divine miracles. The belief in miracles strengthened by the struggle between paganism and Christianity. The same miracle claimed by both. Belief in the announcement of the future in advance the commonest form of the belief in the marvellous amongst the educated. Prognostics in the writings of the historians. Tacitus. Suetonius on Augustus. Continuance of the belief in traditional methods of prophecy. *Haruspicina.* Astrology. Oracles. Their temporary decline owing to the preponderating influence of Italian methods of divination. Their revival and spread of their reputation outside Greek countries. The oracle of Alexander of Abonuteichos. Widespread belief in the significance of dreams. Its connexion with the belief in Providence. The interpretation of dreams a science. The dreambook of Artemidorus. Diseases cured by dreams. The votive tablets of Minerva 'the mindful'. Belief in the efficacy of local divinities outside their proper sphere of influence. Belief in the gods as givers of blessings. Prayer. Votive inscriptions and other religious monuments. Invocation of national and local divinities. General invocation of the gods of definite spheres of influence, especially Jupiter. Lack of definite information as to the number of unbelievers and indifferentists. Atheists a small minority. Cult and its effects on the maintenance of belief. Maintenance of very old forms of cult and ritual in Rome. The ritual of the 'fieldbrethren'. Old local cults in other parts of Italy. Continuance of very old cults in Greece. Continuance of a general participation in religious worship. Sacrifices. Piety shown practically in the building of temples and other endowments for cult purposes (especially the images of the gods and their adornment with clothes and trinkets). Costly temple presents. Military posts for their protection.

CHAP. PAGE

II Provision for priests and temple attendants. Worship of images. The image identified with the divinity. Desecration of the divine images a proof of the strength of the belief in the power of the gods 84–170

II. Judaism and Christianity.

Contrast between monotheism and polytheism. Judaism and Christianity differently related to polytheism. Dispersion of the Jews in the ancient world. The Jewish emigration not especially commercial. Their settlements in the East and Africa, in Rome, in the rest of Italy, in the West and North. Civil and social position of the Jews. Hatred of the Jews. Attractiveness of Judaism. Religious freedom up to the time of Hadrian. *Christianity.* Missionary zeal of the Christians. Persecutions after the time of Trajan. Comparatively small number of martyrs. Chief causes of the rapid spread of Christianity. Impure elements in the Christian communities. Sects. Montanism. The author of the *Refutation of all Heresies.* His account of the career of Callistus. Christian writers on the state of affairs in the Christian communities. Spread of Christianity (especially in Rome) in the first and second centuries. Relation of Christians to the general population. Spread of Christianity amongst the upper classes dates from the time of Commodus. Christianity rarely mentioned and little known up to the third century. Heathen converts of rank before the reign of Commodus. The supposed relations between Seneca and the apostle Paul. The period from Theodosius to Justinian. Christianity treated with contempt up to the third century. The long death-struggle of paganism a proof of its vitality. Pagan elements which survived the downfall of paganism . . 170–214

III Philosophy as a Moral Educator . . 215–281

The connexion of ancient morality with religion and the supposed dangerous effect of

CHAP. PAGE

III anthropomorphism. The example of the gods alleged as an excuse for sin by 'sophistic'. Nature of ancient as contrasted with Christian morality. Relation to the deity and mankind. Moral philosophy. Knowledge the foundation of happiness. Happiness. Resignation. Pagan morality recognized by the Christians. Clement of Alexandria. Spread of Greek philosophy in the Roman world. Opposition to philosophy. Antipathies due to the Roman national character. Philosophy disliked by the authorities. Persecutions of philosophers. Change after the death of Domitian. Philosophy in favour under Marcus Aurelius and Septimius Severus. Attempts to represent philosophy as harmless to the government. Seneca. Philosophy disliked by the masses. Most uneducated and many educated men regarded it as useless. The contrast between rhetoricians and philosophers. The elder Seneca. Quintilian. Fronto. Lucian. Aristides. Opponents of philosophy appeal to the immorality of its professors. Pseudo-philosophers in Rome and Greece, especially under Marcus Aurelius. The Cynics. Philosophy recognized amongst the Romans as a guide to morality. Differences of opinion as to the amount of philosophical training required. Roman sympathy for philosophy. The school of the Sextii. Spread of Stoicism, Epicureanism, and other systems amongst the Romans. Philosophy usually begun in early youth. Logic and Dialectic. Physics. Ethics. The teachers' right and obligation to supervise their pupils' manner of life. Teachers of philosophy under three aspects. (1) As educators and spiritual advisers in distinguished families. Lucian's description of their treatment. Philosophers at court. (2) As heads of public schools. Instruction in philosophical schools unsatisfactory. Both pupils and teachers in part responsible for the failure. Flowery language and eagerness for applause. (3) Philosophers as moral missionaries and popular 214–281

CHAP. PAGE

III preachers (Cynics). Demetrius. Demonax. Peregrinus. Points of resemblance between Christianity and Cynicism. Standard of morality elevated by the development of philosophy in the early centuries. The assumption of a general decay of morality during this period unfounded.

IV Belief in the Immortality of the Soul . 282–313

Attitude of the educated towards the belief in immortality. The elder Pliny. Materialistic epitaphs. Epicureanism. Denial of immortality in other systems. Belief in and proof of immortality. Platonism and neo-Pythagoreanism. The doubters. Galen. Quintilian. Tacitus. Cicero as the representative of believers amongst the educated eclectics. The Stoics. Seneca. Figurative representations on monuments a proof of the belief in immortality. This belief held by a vast majority amongst the masses. Popular ideas of the underworld. Belief in the ferryman of the dead. Widespread idea of a more or less material existence after death. Belief in apparitions a proof of the belief in immortality. Incantation of the spirits of the dead. 'Devotion'. Difference between the Christian and pagan belief in immortality. Connexion between the living and the dead unbroken in the Greek and Roman cult of the dead. Desire to be remembered by posterity. Christian view of death, if not followed by resurrection. Pessimism of the ancients. Death the greatest blessing that nature has given to man.

Index 315

CHAPTER I

BELLES-LETTRES

POETRY AND ARTISTIC PROSE

In the following investigation an attempt will be made to show that the influence of poetry on education in general in later Roman times was much more comprehensive and far-reaching than in modern days. For this purpose it will be necessary to obtain an idea of the relation of the educated world to poetry, the mission of the latter, the resulting position of poets, and lastly the substitution of artistic prose for poetry.

The relation of the educated world to poetry was in great measure determined by the instruction given to youth, the aims and methods of which were entirely different from those of to-day. The aim of the modern instruction of youth is to put him in the way of defining his attitude in regard to the most important branches of human knowledge, to facilitate, as far as possible, his understanding of the manifold works of science, and to render him capable of taking his part in them. On the other hand, in antiquity its task was far simpler, since the branches of learning now taught in schools did not exist at all or only in a rudimentary condition, or were not considered as forming part of a general education. The development of the creative faculties, not increased power of receptivity, was the object in view. Education was not intended to facilitate the acquisition of comprehensive knowledge, but of special excellences; of a perfect mastery of linguistic expression; of the artistic employment of words to set forth ideas in a clear and persuasive manner; of the choice of the most suitable and elegant phraseology.

In republican times, when language, far more than knowledge at the present day, represented 'power'; when, as Tacitus says, 'no one attained great power without the aid of elo-

quence', this is easy to understand. But although political eloquence was reduced to silence after the downfall of the republic, the lively susceptibility of the southerners to the 'living word' and all the habits of ancient life still rendered necessary to a certain extent in all cases public and spoken utterances; and even under the empire the relation of the written to the spoken word, as far as their importance and influence on each other were concerned, was inverse to that in which they stand in the modern world. 'It is by the power of language', says Diodorus, 'that the Greeks are superior to the barbarians, the educated to the uneducated; by this alone one man can be superior to many'. 'It is easy', says the elder Seneca, 'to pass from eloquence to all other arts and accomplishments; it equips even those, whom it does not train with special reference to itself'.

Eloquence was indispensable not only for advocates and teachers, but also for higher officers or functionaries, for the senator or statesman, and, generally speaking, for all who aspired to a prominent position in life. The best standard of the value attached to it in imperial times, the best proof that it was even then regarded as the most important element in education generally, is the fact that it held the first place in the different branches of instruction, and long remained the only one for the teaching of which the state considered it its duty to provide. The first public professorships founded by the government in Rome and endowed with an ample salary (100,000 sesterces) were those of Greek and Roman oratory. The emperor, who imposed this burden on the treasury and summoned Quintilian, 'the glory of the Roman *toga*',[1] to the Roman chair, and made him 'the chief controller of the unsteady youth', was Vespasian, the economical ruler, the inveterate opponent of all ideal tendencies, in whose eyes practical needs were everything. Soon, not merely the large cities of Italy (at least about the middle of the second century), but even many smaller towns and the provinces had their professors of eloquence appointed by the communities; the largest no doubt, like Rome, had chairs of both Greek and Latin.

An unremitting and exclusive study of poetry prepared the way for the teaching of eloquence. The poet 'formed the stammering lips of the child'; reading and elucidation of

[1] Referring to his practice as an advocate, when it was necessary to wear the *toga*.

the poets was almost the only subject of school instruction for the rising generation. On the other hand, only a trifling knowledge of music and geometry was recognized as necessary or desirable; the former, instruction in which was frequently limited to theory, seems to have owed its admission into the curriculum to its connexion with poetry, which was far closer than in our own days. The youthful mind was also introduced by poetry to some other branches of learning—geography, astronomy (which in both Greek and Latin furnished themes for poetical descriptions), philosophy, the history of literature, and history proper, in which legend and mythology were generally included. At the same time children were intended to adopt and assimilate the doctrines of morality and worldly wisdom from the poets, whose maxims were probably collected for this purpose in numerous selections especially adapted for school use.

Where a higher education was aimed at, the instruction at school of course included Greek as well as Latin poets. It began with Homer, a course approved by Quintilian; 'for although riper years were necessary for a complete understanding of his poetry, every one would read him more than once'. Of other poetical works he mentions tragedies and lyric poems; he would apparently only exclude those which might offend the scrupulous, for example, elegies; he especially recommends Menander, whose pieces were read in boys' and girls' schools in Ovid's time. Even in the last days of antiquity Homer and Menander were given to boys beginning Greek. The father of the poet Statius kept a school at Naples, which, as his son assures us, was attended not merely by boys from the neighbouring towns, but also from Lucania and Apulia. At this school Homer, Hesiod, Theocritus, Pindar, Ibycus, Alcman, Stesichorus, Sappho, Corinna, Callimachus, Lycophron, Sophron and other poets were read. Certainly, such an extended study of Greek poetry outside of Greek countries would hardly have been possible, except in a city like Naples, where the Greek language and manners still held their ground; but it may fairly be assumed that every educated man, probably when he left school, had some acquaintance with the most important Greek poets. This is shown by Seneca's story of Calvisius Sabinus, who, to appear learned, made his slaves learn the poets by heart from which he was fond of quoting; in

addition to Homer and Hesiod, he mentions the nine lyric poets.

We know nothing further as to the choice of the Greek poets for school instruction, whether or to what extent it varied at different periods; but we do know that the Latin poets read at school in the second century were not the same as those read in the first; a change due to the revolution in literary and artistic taste, which began after the time of Nero and was complete at the beginning of the second century.

In the first century, Virgil was the first Latin poet put into the hands of the young; and his poems were the foundation and the main subject of the Latin course, as those of Homer of the Greek. Next to him probably Horace was most read; even at the beginning of the second century their busts usually adorned the schoolroom [1]. The grammarian Quintus Caecilius Epirota, a freedman of Cicero's friend Atticus, is said to have been the first to introduce the most modern poets as a part of the curriculum in his school, opened after the death of his patron the poet Cornelius Gallus (died 26 B.C.) In this he read and commented on the poems of Virgil (evidently before the death of the latter in 19 B.C.) and other living poets, which gained him from Martial the name of 'nurse of poets in swaddling clothes'. But Caecilius probably only established as the rule what had hitherto been the exception; for Horace, in a satire written several years later, declares it is folly for a poet to desire the applause of the multitude and to feel flattered at his poems being read in second-rate schools, where, to all appearance, after this period the works of the most modern living poets were read by preference. We may conclude that Lucan's epic was read at school immediately after its publication from the fact that in Vespasian's time poetical ornament 'from the sanctuary of Virgil, Horace, and Lucan' was required of the orator; this is further confirmed by the express statement of Suetonius and the extraordinary care taken by the booksellers in the get-up of his works, the sale of which, says Martial, was the best proof that he was a poet. Persius says it is a fine thing for a poet to have his verses dictated to a number of curly-headed boys; and the statement of the scholiast, that this refers to Nero's poems, which at that time were in general use in schools, is in

[1] Juvenal, vii, 227. According to the scholiast, however, the reference is to copies of their works.

itself very probable. At the conclusion of his *Thebaid*, Statius could assert that this poem, the result of twelve years' labour, was already eagerly studied by the youth of Italy. Martial, whose poems were of course entirely unfitted for educational purposes owing to their indecencies, represents his sportive Muse as asking him whether he felt inclined to put on the *cothurnus* of tragedy or celebrate wars in epic, ' that a pompous schoolmaster might read him in a hoarse voice, and that he might become the aversion of growing girls and good young men '.

But at that time it had long been a subject of dispute in literary circles, whether the preference should be given to ancient or modern literature and of course the out-and-out supporters of the former would not hear of the latter in the schools. As early as the time of Vespasian there had sprung up a keen opposition to the extravagances, unnaturalness and affectation of modern prose. Quintilian, whose authority undoubtedly was decisive in many quarters, was on the side of the opposition. On entering upon his professional duties, he found Seneca, the most brilliant of the modern writers, the object of the universal and enthusiastic admiration of young men, just because of his dazzling and misleading errors, which his imitators multiplied and outdid. Quintilian and those who thought with him strove for and brought about a regeneration of prose on the basis of the Ciceronian style, which, remodelled in conformity with the needs of the time, gained in mobility, colour and brilliancy.

But even then some of the archaists were greatly dissatisfied. They believed it was necessary to go back about a century, to find the models by which the degenerate taste could be re-educated ; they extolled the elder Cato, the old chroniclers, orators such as Gracchus, and the poets of the time of the Punic wars (Naevius, Ennius, Plautus, Accius, Pacuvius, Lucilius and their contemporaries), and of course also wanted to see them introduced into the schools. About the year 90 this tendency had gained ground to such an extent that Quintilian recognized the last demand as legitimate. He was too moderate and liberal-minded, his taste was too fine for him to take sides in the dispute, least of all with the archaists ; his views were far more modern ; he did not share their enthusiasm for Plautus and Ennius, and only accorded

the latter the respect due to what is consecrated by age. In his review of the standard authors he does not even mention Cato or Gracchus. However, he admitted that it was proper to read the old poets at school. According to him, their works were certainly well adapted to nourish and promote the development of a boy's mind, although their strength lay rather in their truth to nature than in their art ; but they were especially calculated to increase the *copia verborum*, tragedy by its seriousness and dignity, comedy by its elegance. Their composition also, regarded artistically, was more careful than that of most of the moderns, who considered sententious phrases the chief beauty of poetical works. Consequently, it is in the works of the older writers that moral earnestness and internal vigour must be looked for, since the language of the moderns has degenerated owing to its ultra-refinement and affectation. Finally, Quintilian appeals to the example of Cicero and other great orators, who certainly knew what they were about, when they introduced into their speeches so many passages from Ennius, Accius, Pacuvius, Lucilius, Terence and others. To all appearance, it was under Hadrian that the archaists gained the upper hand. The fact that the Emperor, who preferred Cato to Cicero and Ennius to Virgil, gave them his support, was bound to ensure their supremacy ; and under the two Antonines they appear to have obtained almost absolute control over literature and the schools, to judge from the reputation enjoyed by such a nonentity as Fronto, their most extreme representative.

But even the members of this party held divergent opinions ; the most exclusive and absolute veneration for the ancients, combined with equal contempt for the moderns, is to be found in Fronto. In his correspondence with his royal pupils, Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, which is full of quotations from ancient literature, the names of Virgil and Livy will be looked for in vain ; Horace is mentioned once. Only after the accession of Marcus, when begging permission to resume his former duties as teacher, does he mention Seneca and Lucan, and then only to issue a most serious warning against both. He then expresses, with indescribably comic apprehension, his serious anxiety on the subject of a certain penchant for the modern exhibited by Marcus in one of his speeches. He allows that there are many beauties in Lucan, but ' little pieces of

silver are to be found even in sewers ', if any one likes to rummage for them. The safest thing is to abstain from reading such works altogether, ' for on slippery ground there is always more danger of tripping '.

Aulus Gellius, on the whole, held the same views as Fronto ; he thought it necessary to mention Seneca once, in order to pronounce strongly and decisively against him. He thinks it will be enough to quote the offensive criticisms of this ' insipid and insensate ' fellow upon Ennius, Virgil and Cicero ; Lucan he never mentions. But Gellius, although a great pedant, was by no means without taste and was less narrow-minded than Fronto ; he admired Virgil as much as Ennius. Certainly, he mentions no other poets of the Augustan age except Horace, whom he pays the honour of citing a passage in support of the name of a wind.

Thus, in the course of about a hundred years, a complete revolution in literary taste had taken place ; the prose and verse writers who had been admired and imitated in the first century were despised and ignored in the second, and *vice versa*. The number of poets which the two periods united in admiring, appears to have been small ; in addition to Virgil, whose greatness even the archaists never contested, a special favourite was Catullus, for whom even the moderns had an affection, and whom Martial imitated before all others. Juvenal is the last of the moderns ; he had a lively recollection of how Statius, the celebrated epic poet of the party in the time of Domitian, delighted all Rome by the announcement that he would read his *Thebaid ;* how all flocked to hear him and were enchanted ; how the seats collapsed from the frenzied stamping of the audience. But a generation later, Statius was completely forgotten, and in the time of Hadrian Lucan had long ceased to be read in schools. Nevertheless, several of the moderns still had friends and readers ; thus, Aelius Verus was especially fond of Ovid and Martial (whom he called his Virgil), who was one of the poets most frequently read to the last days of antiquity. But the friends of this kind of literature cannot have been very numerous in the second century. Ennius, to whom Quintilian thought he had shown sufficient respect by allowing him to pass as a venerable relic of antiquity, was now in every one's mouth. Reciters of Ennius (*Enneanistae*) toured Italy, and Aulus Gellius tells how one

of them read the *Annals* of Ennius in a theatre at Puteoli, amidst the enthusiastic applause of his audience. Grammarians (φιλόλογοι) had above all to be strong on Ennius. In a letter (written in 161) to his former pupil, the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, who had gone for a few days to Alsium to recruit, Fronto pictures the emperor reading for amusement after his siesta, 'seeking refinement from Plautus, taking his fill of Accius, enjoying the charm of Lucretius, or firing his imagination with Ennius'.

It goes without saying that the few poets of talent whom that age produced moved on the lines of the ancient authors. The poets Annianus and Julius Paullus, friends of Gellius, were intimately acquainted with the ancient language and literature, the second being one of the most learned men of his day; another learned poet, a friend of Fronto, was well read in Plautus and Ennius. A short but very characteristic specimen of archaistic poetry has been preserved in the epitaph of a certain Marcus Pomponius Bassulus, chief municipal magistrate of Aeclanum, written by himself after the manner of Plautus in elegant old-fashioned Latin, and in a style commendably free from exaggeration [1].

Naturally this radical revolution in taste brought about a similar change in the school curriculum; the modern poets were either entirely displaced by the ancient or at most tolerated by their side. In Quintilian's time the old poets were probably read in many schools concurrently with the modern; when Gellius went to school, Ennius was read everywhere.

But there were still poets who were put into the hands of the young, read, explained and learnt by heart in school. Poetry at that time was not an 'extra', an occupation for spare hours; it was not looked upon as an amusement, but as a subject for serious study. It is difficult to estimate the effects of a system of education, which regarded the works of the national poets and of those of kindred peoples as the most important instrument of culture, and as almost the only nourishment of the youthful intellect. It necessarily filled the memory with poetical turns and expressions; roused and elevated the activity of the imagination by a wealth of

[1] See *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, ix., 1164. Mommsen in *Hermes*, iii. on historical grounds considers Bassulus a near contemporary of Trajan; Ritschl, from considerations of style, assigns him to the second (or perhaps the third) century.

imagery ; early developed the sense of beauty of form and artistic representation, and made it second nature for impressionable minds. The effect of these impressions, firmly imprinted on the mind, at a time when it is most susceptible, must have lasted a lifetime.

In addition to this, the professors sometimes (perhaps frequently) were poets themselves, and thus were able to persuade, and actually did persuade, their pupils to try their hand at poetry and assisted them in their attempts. Learning and poetry were not antagonistic at Rome, any more than formerly at Alexandria and subsequently in the age of humanism ; in both places it was quite an ordinary thing for the same person to be both savant and poet ; among the philological celebrities of Alexandria, Aristarchus, who disdained poetry, was a prominent exception. ' Only a mind rendered fruitful by a powerful stream of literature ', says the poet in Petronius, ' is capable of conceiving and bringing forth a poetical work '. One of the most usual titles of honour bestowed on the poets was ' learned ', not in our sense of the word, but implying a perfect knowledge of the forms and rules of the art, acquired by the study of the best models. The oldest schoolmasters of Rome, such as Ennius and Livius Andronicus, were poets, and this was probably often the case in later times. Valerius Cato, surnamed ' the Latin siren ', who lived in the last days of the republic, was considered an excellent teacher for students of poetry, a man, ' who not merely expounded, but made poets '. Lucius Melissus, appointed by Augustus superintendent of the library in the *porticus* of Octavia, was also a poet and invented a new kind of Latin comedy. The father of the poet Statius had gained the prize in poetical contests not only in his native city Naples, but also in Greece ; he had sung of the burning of the Capitol in the civil war of 69, and intended to make the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 (which destroyed Herculaneum and Pompeii) the subject of a poem ; his son enjoyed his advice and guidance in the composition of his *Thebaid*.

But even without direct encouragement, lads possessed of a certain taste and gift for form were bound to find in this intensive application to poetry at school a sufficient incentive to poetical attempts of their own ; to all appearance precocity was rather the rule than the exception. Catullus had already

written his first love-songs ' when first the white robe (the *toga virilis*) was bestowed upon him '. Ovid began to compose still earlier. When a mere boy, the Muse secretly attracted him, and verses flowed from his pen long before he was of age ; he read his first poem in public, ' when his beard was just beginning to sprout '. Propertius began his attempts at poetry after assuming the *toga virilis*. Virgil wrote his *Culex* when he was sixteen ; Lucan (A.D. 39–65) was only fourteen or fifteen when he composed his *Iliacon*, the subject of which was the same as that of the last three books of the *Iliad*. It was in existence till a late period, as well as another poem (*Catachthonion*) on the underworld ; in his twenty-first year he was an unsuccessful competitor with a panegyric on Nero for the prize at the *Agon* founded by the latter, and began the *Pharsalia* a year later. The boyish productions of Persius were destroyed by his mother after his death on the advice of Cornutus. Nero also when a boy had shown by his poems that he possessed the elements of a good education, and Lucius Verus at the same age was equally fond of writing poetry. The poems written by the first Gordian (apparently before he entered the rhetorical school), which included an *Antoninias* (the lives of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius Antoninus) were still extant in the time of Constantine. Martial was glad to find the poetical trifles of his schoolboy days, which he had almost forgotten himself, for sale at the book shops ; the reputation of Serranus, who died young, was made by his boyish poems which caused great things to be expected of him. The elder Statius excited universal admiration by taking part in a poetical competition when a boy, and parents pointed him out to their children as an example ; the rhetorician Publius Annius Florus, when a boy, competed for the Capitoline wreath with a poem on the Dacian triumph, and the eleven year old Quintus Sulpicius Maximus with improvised Greek hexameters; the thirteen year old Lucius Valerius Pudens of Histonium obtained it (in 106) by the unanimous verdict of the judges.

In olden times Greek poets such as Antipater of Sidon and Licinius Archias of Antioch were famous for their improvisation, an accomplishment which was very common at Tarsus in the time of Strabo. It was probably also frequently practised in Rome, where it was facilitated by the stereotyped turns and formulas in which the language of poetry abounded,

and the easily accessible store of metaphors and similes, common places, and mythological parallels ; again, it was recommended as a means of acquiring a complete mastery of expression and metres. The mimograph Publilius of Syria is said to have challenged the dramatists to a contest in improvisation on subjects set by each side ; by his skill in the art of his native land he defeated all his competitors, including his most important rival Laberius. Quintilian speaks of improvisation as an art much practised in his time. Lucan improvised an *Orpheus* (in hexameters), the subject apparently being set to several poets at the same time. Martial, who combined a ready facility in the treatment of form with the capacity of striking the most varied notes, no doubt improvised a considerable number of his epigrams, at banquets, and on given subjects. The poems of Statius thrown off on the spur of the moment on special occasions, were at least improvisations in the wider sense of the word. Apollinaris Sidonius in addition to shorter improvisations, also mentions a longer one, in which he competed with three friends at a banquet in the treatment of the same theme in different metres.

Thus prepared, lads and young men passed into the rhetorical schools, where, partly under the guidance of the professors, they studied prose instead of poetical models. Here also, of course, the prevailing literary tendency exercised the same influence upon the choice of authors as in the boys' schools. For young beginners Quintilian recommended Livy and Cicero (Sallust for the more advanced), and found it necessary to issue a warning against putting Gracchus and Cato into the hands of lads. Fronto, on the other hand, recommended these authors and the like to the young Marcus Aurelius, and the prince, who was then in his twenty-second year, entirely shared his master's taste ; he early gave up the study of Horace and devoted himself exclusively to Cato, while at the same time he found great edification in the speeches of Gracchus. Cicero, however, although not exactly an orator after Fronto's heart, was also recognized by the archaists as a model, and considered by many not inferior to Gracchus, to the annoyance of Aulus Gellius ; even in the second century he maintained his place in the rhetorical schools at least as firmly as Virgil in the grammatical.

Instruction in the rhetorical schools consisted mainly of

special exercises, gradually increasing in difficulty, under the teacher's guidance. These exercises, starting from the subjects and ideas derived from the works of the poets in the grammatical schools, were in a measure admirably adapted to foster and develop the poetical inclinations which had been already aroused. At first the pupils wrote on given subjects. In narrating historical events, on which they had to try their hand first, they were accustomed to insert excessively detailed descriptions of every kind 'in imitation of poetic licence'; however, intelligent teachers preferred these youthful vagaries, which at least showed ability, to meagreness and aridity. The next exercises consisted of an examination of the probability or improbability of legends and legendary narratives: e.g. whether it was credible that a crow really perched on the head of Valerius in his duel with a Gaul, flapped his wings in the latter's face and pecked out his eyes; the nature of the serpent, which is said to have begotten Scipio, or the wolf of Romulus and Remus; Numa's Egeria; and similar themes which ancient Greek history in particular provided in abundance.

Further: the praise or censure of famous men; so-called commonplaces, especially dealing with the foolish and vicious types of mankind (the adulterer, the gambler, the debauchee, the pimp, the parasite) or their varieties (the blind adulterer, the impoverished gambler, the old debauchee); comparisons, e.g. of town and country life, of the legal and military professions, of marriage and celibacy; investigation of the origins of certain customs and ideas, e.g. why Venus is represented as armed by the Lacedaemonians, why the boy Cupid was conceived as having wings and equipped with bow, arrow and torch. These things for the most part readily adapted themselves to poetical treatment, the last named for instance being actually the subject of one of Propertius's elegies, while the superior advantages of a country life were a favourite theme of the poets.

After these and similar preparations, the pupil began to attempt oratorical exercises, the so-called 'declamations'. Beginners delivered monologues in the *rôle* of some well-known historical personage, in which the reasons for and against an important and decisive resolution were set forth (such monologues were called *suasoriae*). The characters

and the situations were sometimes taken from poetry, e.g. Agamemnon deliberating whether he should sacrifice Iphigenia, but in the majority of cases from ancient Roman history, e.g. Hannibal deliberating whether he should lead his troops against Rome, Sulla whether he should lay down the dictatorship, Cicero whether he should apologize to Antony in order to save his life. Persius, when a small boy, often rubbed his eyes with oil, so as to be able to shirk school on the plea of sore eyes, if he did not feel inclined to learn the pathetic speech of Cato before his suicide—a speech in which an intelligent teacher could find nothing to praise, but which the father of the hopeful son invited his friends to hear and to which he himself listened 'in perspiring ecstasy'. Such tasks, which required young people to identify themselves with men of the past and to reproduce the emotional tension of the crises of their lives could only be adequately performed by true poets; nevertheless, they could not fail to arouse the youthful imagination in various ways and to develop in it an activity approximating to the poetical.

This, however, was the case to a far greater extent in the last, most difficult and most protracted exercises of the rhetorical school. These were entirely dramatic in character and were called *controversiae*, i.e. disputes in which the pupils took sides, as accusers, defenders, or advocates. In early times, cases of recent occurrence or known from history were selected, such as the following mentioned by Suetonius. Several young men, who had gone on an excursion from Rome to Ostia, saw some fishermen on the point of drawing in their nets. They bought the catch in advance for ready money. After a long wait, the net was pulled up, and found to contain no fish, but a basket of gold neatly tied up. Both parties accordingly laid claim to the treasure. In another case, certain slave-dealers, having put their cargo ashore at Brundisium, in order to cheat the custom house officers out of the duty for a beautiful and valuable slave, dressed him in a purple-embroidered *toga*, and hung a golden *bulla* [1] round his neck. On their arrival at Rome, the fraud was detected and the freedom of the boy demanded, since his master,

[1] A round or heart-shaped box worn round the neck by free-born children; those of wealthy parents wore a golden *bulla*, those of poor parents one of leather.

by dressing him in that manner, had practically renounced the right of ownership.

But such cases soon came to be regarded as not sufficiently interesting. Criminal cases took the place of property disputes, and fictitious cases were substituted for real ones: questions of civil law and history form only a very small part of the extant collections of *controversiae*, and even those of an historical character have been garbled to produce a greater effect. Certainly, sensible masters demanded that fiction should resemble reality as far as possible; but to all appearance their resistance to the prevailing taste, which clamoured for thrilling and piquant situations, strong seasoning and drastic effects, was practically without result. This is shown by the first collection of *Controversiae* (that of the elder Seneca in the time of Augustus) and even more by succeeding ones, as well as by the repeated complaints of the predominance of the nonsensical in the rhetorical schools. According to Petronius, the fault lay, not with the teachers, who, if they did not wish to see their classes empty, were obliged to do as others did, but in the vanity of the parents. Quintilian himself considered the exclusion of all 'incredible and poetical subjects in the proper sense of the word' too severe and impracticable; it was necessary to allow the young people some recreation and amusement, provided that the subjects although emotional and full of bombast, were not foolish and ridiculous.

Unfortunately, the *controversiae* were often to a great extent both foolish and ridiculous. For the most part, even if not actually contrary to reality, they were far removed from it; they made a rule of what should at most have been allowed as an exception; they were on the borderline of possibility, or even overstepped it. In time the rhetorical school created for itself a fantastic world of its own, separated from practical life by a deep gulf which could not be bridged. The existence of imaginary justice, of imaginary, even impossible, laws was assumed; for instance, ingratitude, or a crime not provided for by the law was admitted as actionable. The persons and circumstances of these fictions were purely imaginary; it never occurred to any one to regard them as pictures of real life. It may appear strange that, during the last periods of imperial despotism, when men's minds

bent beneath the yoke of the most fearful oppression and the last trace of freedom of speech had disappeared, tyrants were the stock characters in the *controversiae*, and 'declaimers' breathed hatred of tyrants and extolled tyrannicide. But these tyrants, 'who issued edicts, ordering sons to execute their fathers', were in reality as harmless as marionettes, except to the teacher, 'whose pupils, in a full classroom, one after the other put their favourite tyrant to death'. If Caligula banished the rhetorican Secundus Carinas for such a declamation, if Domitian put Maternus to death for the same reason, it must be remembered that Caligula was capable of any extravagance, and that Domitian welcomed any excuse, however trifling, for an act of violence; these two instances are exceptional, and there is no evidence that they in any way affected the choice of such subjects.

Next to fearful tyrants, brutal pirates were the favourite subject in the rhetorical schools, 'standing on the bank rattling chains'; sometimes they had lovely daughters, as in the following story. A young man, who has fallen into the hands of the pirates, in vain beseeches his father in a letter to ransom him. The daughter of the pirate chief makes him take an oath to marry her, if he gains his freedom. He swears; she elopes with him, he returns home and marries her. The marriage of his son with a wealthy orphan is proposed to the father, who calls upon the son to consent and to repudiate the pirate's daughter. The son refuses, and is himself repudiated by the father.—As a rule, the actors on both sides were involved in the most painful and strenuous conflicts between equally sacred obligations, equally strong and legitimate feelings and inclinations.—A sick man asks his slave to give him poison; he refuses; in his will he orders that his slave should be crucified; the slave appeals to the tribunes. In a civil war, the father and brother of a woman are on one side, her husband on the other; she follows the latter. He is killed; the wife flees for refuge to her father, who spurns her; on her asking, 'How am I to appease you?' he replies, 'Die!' She hangs herself at his door. Whereupon the son proposes that the father should be declared insane.—The father of three sons, having lost two by death, becomes blind by excessive weeping. He dreams that, if the third son dies, he will recover his sight. He tells the dream to his wife,

who tells it to his son, who immediately hangs himself. The father recovers his sight, but repudiates his wife, who disputes his right to do so.—A husband repudiates his wife for adultery ; their son demands and receives from his father a sum of money, ostensibly for the support of a mistress, but really for his starving mother ; the father finds it out and repudiates the son, who defends what he has done.

The most striking contrasts were freely introduced. Stock figures were the poor and the rich man, mutually hostile (for instance, the poor man's bees gather honey in the rich man's garden, who poisons the flowers, and so kills the bees) ; on the other hand, their children are often fond lovers. Maidens of noble birth are sold for the brothel, dishonoured maidens are given the choice between the punishment of the criminal or marriage with him ; young men of noble birth are compelled to enter the disgraceful profession of gladiator, e.g. to obtain an advance of money to bury a father. Terrible afflictions overtake individuals and whole countries. The plague especially was a favourite subject, which according to the oracle can only be stayed by the sacrifice of some young maidens ; a country is visited by famine and the inhabitants are finally reduced to eating the corpses of the victims. Bodily and mental afflictions of an exceptional nature, such as blindness (and its wonderful cure) and insanity ; miracles (a woman brings forth a negro child and is accused of adultery) ; cruel punishments (hurling from a rock) and torture ; murder and suicide, especially by hanging and poison (the cutting of the rope and the pouring out of the poison were stereotyped *motifs*) ; horrible crimes such as parricide and the mutilation of children, trained to beg by one who lives on what they receive ; but especially family horrors of all kinds (of course 'stepmothers, more wicked even than in tragedy' are frequent characters)—such were the favourite ingredients for the preparation of strongly effective *controversiae*, which were so greatly in demand, and which always elicited thunders of applause in the schools.

It is remarkable and at the same time the clearest proof that these fictions partook of the character of novels, that Seneca was laid under contribution more than any other ancient authority in a collection of novels and anecdotes widely circulated in the middle ages, the *Gesta Romanorum*.

The 'enchanters', who subsequently played an important part in these themes, were perhaps only introduced later, for Quintilian is the first to complain of them, while they are not mentioned in Seneca, Petronius and Tacitus; on the other hand, in the collection which bears the name of Quintilian, there is a case of hatred excited by a magic potion, an astrological prophecy, and a really excellent specimen of this class, 'the enchanted tomb'. A mother, who has lost her son, is visited nightly by the latter in a dream. She tells her husband, who gets a magician to cast a spell over the tomb; the visitations cease; but the wife then brings a complaint against her husband, 'on the score of ill-treatment'. Perhaps the Greek rhetorical schools are the source of the stories of magic. The magician who attempts to kill by enchantment another who has seduced his wife, and being unsuccessful tries to commit suicide, is a common subject for a theme in Greece towards the end of the second century.

In the Greek rhetorical schools, the subjects of oratorical exercises differed essentially in character. Certainly there were 'declamations' of *controversiae* and to all appearance on the same themes; the magician, the tyrant, the tyrannicide, the debauched woman, and the poor man are occasionally mentioned as typical figures. But the most difficult and most profitable task for advanced pupils and the masters themselves was clearly not *controversiae*, but persuasive or dissuasive discourses after the manner of the Latin *suasoriae*, speeches in defence or accusation, epideictic, i.e. show speeches, which will be spoken of later. This difference of method had its origin in the totally different appreciation of eloquence by Greeks and Romans. The Romans looked upon it principally as a means to an end, that of upholding one's own interest against all opposing interests, especially in a court of justice; whereas the Greeks of that age considered beauty of form a sufficient end, and skill in its manipulation a desirable and much admired accomplishment.

In Rome, Italy, and the western countries, the great majority of educated persons no doubt attended only the Latin rhetorical schools, or at least preferred them; most of the large towns, however, also had paid teachers of Greek oratory, notably Rome, where the Athenaeum, founded by Hadrian and kept up by his successors, had a separate chair for this subject.

Further, it may be assumed that in western countries, Greek rhetoricians adapted themselves to the system that prevailed in the Latin school; thus, according to Seneca, they competed with one another in the treatment of the same themes, and we know that Isaeus, on his first appearance in Rome, asked for controversial themes for his improvisations. Thus, this system, especially the 'declamation' of *controversiae*, ever exercised a most important influence upon the character of Roman education at the time; the fact that in most cases the school-course ended with these studies, and that the pupils passed at once 'from the fairy tales of the poets and the epilogues of the rhetoricians' into the realities of practical life, there to test the value of what they had acquired at school, considerably increased this influence.

Further, rhetorical themes were also treated in a poetical form. There are extant examples of speeches in verse, most commonly improvised, delivered by persons in certain situations (ἠθοποιΐαι, *ethicae*, an exercise for beginners), in fact, *controversiae* and *suasoriae* in verse. To the last days of antiquity the systems and exercises remained the same in both Greek and Latin rhetorical schools; even themes, which assumed pagan belief and worship, were constantly handled by Christian pupils; evidently, opinions otherwise strictly tabooed were regarded as integrant elements of both rhetorical and grammatical instruction.

The effects of this method of instruction, common to all educated persons, are clearly manifest in the literature of the period. Only superior and specially keen intellects could entirely avoid the dangers, seductions and devious ways of this method of teaching rhetoric. In the case of the majority of pupils, the continuous striving after effect, the habit of intoxicating themselves with phrases and working themselves up into a permanently emotional frame of mind, was bound up to a certain point to make an essentially unreal eloquence a kind of second nature; the more so as it was just the artificial and affected, the dazzling and surprising, the risky and abnormal, which was assured of the loudest applause. Even the greatest intellects of the time could not entirely escape these influences, which chiefly affected the poetry of the first century, which, lacking all elasticity of its own, was rarely able to rise above the pompous stiffness of rhetoric.

Quintilian's opinion, that Lucan, the greatest poetical genius of his time, was more deserving of imitation by orators than by poets, was certainly justified. But while poetry has a rhetorical tinge, that of prose is poetical, an equally necessary result of the system of education. The grammatical school made the boy at home in the world of poetry ; the rhetorical school did not estrange him from it. The themes set, with their melodramatic situations, highly romantic motive and adventurous characters, were bound to lend wings to imagination, and to claim poetical handling ; like the subject, the manner of treatment must often have reached the borderline of poetry or have overstepped it. The rhetorician Arellius Fuscus, one of Ovid's tutors, was fond of indulging in absolutely poetical descriptions (to judge from a specimen in Seneca) and unblushingly on occasion borrowed straight from Virgil. Inversely, Ovid reproduced many sentences of another of his teachers, the rhetorician Porcius Latro, almost word for word. According to Seneca, Ovid's own speeches in the school where he was considered an admirable 'declaimer', were nothing but verse broken up into prose, which was probably the case with many other pupils similarly trained. These rooted habits of the school necessarily held their ground in practical life. 'At the present time', says the apologist of modernism in the *Dialogus* of Tacitus, 'poetical beauty, which must be derived from the sanctuary of Virgil, Horace and Lucan, is required of the orator ; the speeches of the present are related to those of the past as the modern temples glistening with gold and marble to the old erections of rough freestone and shapeless bricks'. We may believe with the poet in Petronius that many who had tried their hand at the bar, took refuge in poetry as a haven of rest, foolishly thinking that it was easier to put together a poem than a *controversia* embellished with sparkling aphorisms. Poetry was akin to eloquence ; it was reckoned among the forms of 'speaking well' in the widest sense of the word, and 'eloquent' (*facundus*) was an extremely common and honourable epithet of a poet. As a result of the mutual relations and points of contact between poetry and prose, the prose of the most matter of fact and unpoetical people in the world ever assumes fresh poetical colouring and is proof in itself that its intimate relation to poetry taught in school was permanently maintained. The

extremely poetical prose of Apuleius shows that the triumphant reaction of the archaists might modify, but could not entirely suppress these influences.

Lastly, it must be observed that a school education was more general in the first than in the second century. By degrees military merit and practical knowledge of business opened the way for the lowly born (and so frequently for the uneducated) to high positions, formerly confined to the descendants of families of the two highest orders. Thus provincials, only to a certain extent romanized, entered these orders in ever increasing numbers. For both these reasons school education among the upper classes ceased to be regarded as an indispensable requirement, or the lack of it as disgraceful or ridiculous. Augustus is said to have recalled a consular legate as insufficiently educated since he had written a word as it was pronounced by the lower classes. Yet, as the number of provincials in the senate increased, we may assume that fault was more frequently found with persons of high position in Rome itself for bad pronunciation and even errors of speech. During his quaestorship, Hadrian was laughed at for his accent when he was reading out an imperial speech. When Marcus Aurelius issued a command in the field in Latin, none of his staff understood him, apparently because his officers did not know how educated persons expressed themselves; indeed, Bassaeus Rufus, praefect of the Praetorian guard, a man of no education, remarked to the emperor that the man addressed knew no Greek. According to Cassius Dio, the aged consul Oclatinius Adventus could not read and was so poor a speaker that he pleaded illness whenever he had to transact negotiations. The statement in Philostratus, that the sophist Hadrian was loudly applauded in Rome even by the knights and senators, who did not understand him, seems to show that a knowledge of Greek had become rare amongst the two first classes.

In Rome itself, about the middle of the second century, the indications of the commencing decay of the Latin language were sufficiently numerous and alarming. The form and meaning of many words was doubtful and disputed; learned men held different views on the fundamental rules of grammar; expressions in use among the vulgar were heard in the mouths of advocates. The barbarisms, which

in the time of Severus made their way into public documents and work on stone, could already be found in individual private inscriptions. The feeling of increasing linguistic uncertainty and confusion, the effort to stem the tide of advancing barbarism, the similar exertions of the atticists in Greece incited the critics and friends of language and literature to zealous investigations in the ancient classics. The friends of Gellius busied themselves specially with these researches, by the aid of which they hoped to regain a surer footing, and to restore purity and clearness of expression. But these well-intended efforts could at best only affect a limited circle; in the face of the preponderance of contrary influences at work since the third century throughout the Latin tongue, incessantly destroying language and intellectual culture, they were completely unimportant. This later period, however, is beyond the scope of this treatise; let us return to the condition of letters in the first two centuries.

The fact that the period with which we are concerned entered upon the heritage of the most brilliant epoch of Roman poetry (the Augustan age), was a second element which, combined with the system of youthful instruction, gave poetry so important an influence on education generally. We need only mention Virgil, Horace, Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid (many other famous poets, such as Varius, are only known to us by name), in order to realize the brilliancy and wealth of poetical productions which matured side by side within the space of a single generation. All classes of poetry were represented—epos, ode, tender or passionate elegy and satire—idyll and poetical epistle, descriptive and didactic poetry. Even drama was included, although nothing likely to live was produced in that branch of literature; the period of dramatic writing was finally past, and its plays are lost to us for ever. In all the other departments of poetry the results were perfect of their kind. Not that any one would ever think of ranking them amongst the highest poetical efforts; no one can for a moment entertain any delusion as to their lack of originality and real genius, notwithstanding their abundant talent, their great dramatic power, their perfect grace, their pure and unerring taste, and their lofty culture. As the Muse had come from Greece to the 'rude people of the Quirites, after they had conquered Hannibal',

so also the new poets refused to walk in any other path than that of the Greeks and loudly and clearly professed themselves their followers. But in the first place, they chose as models, not the old poets, but such as were more within their reach, especially the Alexandrine; and in the second place, the understanding of Greek art had gained infinitely in depth and refinement. The result was that the contemporaries of Augustus reproduced the nobility and beauty of Greek form in quite a different manner from those of the Scipios and even of Sulla and Cicero, whose works must have appeared clumsy, formless and rough by the side of the new productions. Noble forms were created as standards in all departments for every mode of feeling and representation; the structure of the line and the art of composition were elevated to the height demanded by the knowledge of Greek art; but, above all, in the matter of language they did for poetry what Cicero had done for prose, and this was the greatest and most lasting creation of that period.

As Cicero was the founder of a prose adapted to increased culture, so the Augustan poets were the creators of a new poetical language. They developed the poetical power of expression of Latin in all directions in a manner formerly scarcely dreamed of, bestowed upon it wealth, variety and fulness, beauty and grace, vigour and dignity. They thus exercised an immense influence not merely on the prose and verse literature of the succeeding centuries of antiquity, but upon that of all later times, an influence which they will probably continue to exercise as long as literature exists. These poets were animated by a true and genuine Roman patriotism; they desired to secure for their nation the only possession for which they still envied Greece. To dispute with the Greeks for preeminence in the plastic arts or astronomy appeared unworthy of the great people which, more than any other, had proved its skill in ruling others, in 'sparing the conquered and vanquishing the proud'; but to appropriate their poetical artistic form was a lofty aim and one worth striving for. 'To secure the fame of this achievement for the great people and its native language was the main object for which the poets of the Augustan age so earnestly strove'; and so far as such a thing was possible, they succeeded.

In their efforts they were assisted by the consciousness

that they were not working for a single country and a single people, but for the human race; that their works would form part of the literature of the world. Ennius had been brought to write poetry for the rulers of Italy, Virgil and his contemporaries knew that they were writing for mankind in general; and indeed the outlook upon an horizon so immense was enough to make them giddy. The prophecy of Horace, that 'the most distant peoples would one day know his works', is well-known. It has been literally fulfilled, like that of Ovid, that the lamentations uttered by him in exile on the barren shores of the Euxine would one day traverse all lands and seas, and would be heard from East to West. They even lived to see their predictions in part fulfilled. Ovid could boast that the whole world read him; Propertius, that his reputation had penetrated to the inhabitants of the shores of the wintry Borysthenes. In fact, the works of the living poets were probably read wherever Roman teachers found their way.

The most exalted idea of the magnificence of the new political organization of the world-wide empire, the immensity of its resources and of the all-conquering influence of the Roman language cannot prevent our astonishment at the rapidity with which the Romans succeeded in 'uniting so many discordant and barbarous tongues by the bonds of intercourse'. Scarcely more than twenty years had passed since the complete subjugation of Pannonia, when Velleius Paterculus wrote his history; and already an acquaintance with the Roman language and writing was widespread in these rude, uncultivated and barbarous countries (the eastern part of Austria, especially Hungary). Roman literature had made its way into the older provinces of the West, as early as the time of Augustus. Livy began one of his later books with the declaration that he had already gained sufficient reputation and only continued his work to satisfy the demands of his restless mind; and this reputation at that time extended beyond Italy, for it is well known that it caused a Spaniard to travel to Rome on purpose to make the acquaintance of Livy; when he had achieved his purpose, he at once returned home. Even then the 'remainders' of new works at Rome were sent to the provinces. Horace sends forth the first book of his *Epistles* to the world with the pros-

pect of serving as food for book-worms unread, or of being shipped off to Ilerda (Lerida) or Utica, when thumbed and dirty by constant handling. The best books, which brought most profit to the retailers, were also sent over sea.

If then, the master-minds of literature in a certain sense lived to find themselves famous throughout the world, their ambition was most completely satisfied in Rome itself. There their poems, which in accordance with a custom recently introduced were recited by them before large audiences, were at once introduced into the schools, or sung at the theatres to the applause of thousands; and finally a comprehensive and active book-trade promoted their sale and multiplied their circulation. Virgil, who died before the publication of his *Aeneid*, had been so successful with his earliest poems (the *Eclogues*), that they were frequently sung on the stage; the actress Cytheris, frequently mentioned in the literary circles of the period, the mistress of Mark Antony and afterwards of the poet Cornelius Gallus (who sang her charms under the name of Lycoris), is said to have sung the sixth eclogue, in which Virgil extols the poetical fame of his friend Gallus. When Virgil happened to be present in the theatre on such an occasion, the whole audience rose and greeted the poet as respectfully as Augustus; in fact, such a distinction was as a rule reserved for emperors and members of the imperial household. When the poet during his later years, which were mostly spent in southern Italy (especially Naples), occasionally visited Rome and appeared in public, he was obliged to take refuge in a house from the crowd which followed him.

Certainly, the fame and popularity of Virgil among his contemporaries and posterity, and consequently the influence of his poetry, were greater than that of any other Roman poet, and indeed unexampled. His popularity may justly be compared with Schiller's. In the case of both, it is evident that the sublime, the ideal, and the noble in art, instead of repelling or intimidating, as might have been anticipated, attracted the masses even more than its popular forms. The truth is, that men feel more gratitude, respect and love for the mind which uplifts them to itself and impresses them with the feeling that there is in them something akin to a higher nature, than for one which descends to their level.

Virgil's poetry made its way into all educational circles and into all strata of society ; artisans and shopkeepers had his verses constantly on their lips and used them as mottoes. Even the most ignorant could quote scraps from the *Aeneid*, and at banquets where the guests were entertained with jugglers' tricks, imitations of animals' voices and farcical performances, pieces from the *Aeneid* were recited, although, no doubt, atrociously. Like the Bible in modern times, the works of Virgil were opened in times of anxiety, and the first passage on which the eye lighted was regarded as an oracle of destiny ; this method of divination was also practised in Renascence times. In literary circles his birthday (October 15), was kept by a number of admirers, and the temple oracles (e.g., those of Praeneste and Patavium as late as the third century) gave their responses in the words of Virgil.

No other poet, as we have remarked, attained such unexampled popularity ; but the walls of Pompeii show that Propertius and Ovid also were widely known. Here, in addition to lines from Virgil (some obviously written by schoolboys), verses from these and other poets have been scrawled with the stylus, partly word for word, partly parodies, especially in the Basilica, which was used as a fashionable promenade. Jacob Grimm's remark in reference to Schiller may explain their popularity. ' The multitude is pleased with the poetry which in style and ideas reaches the high level of modern education ; the old-fashioned manner of the past seems strange to the people, which desires to be initiated into the standpoint of the present '. ' The multitude, which is affected by a beautiful poem, desires to enjoy it with all modern advantages, and is ready to renounce the old '.

Even in ancient times, the people of Italy were probably as impressionable to poetry as at the end of the sixteenth century, when Tasso's *Jerusalem* so rapidly became popular, and Montaigne was astonished to hear shepherdesses singing Ariosto. The influence of the school, which was practically non-existent in more modern times, must have made the poetry of the Augustan age far more widely known in the first two centuries. The theatre, where probably poems were often sung, also co-operated with the school ; and their joint influence depended partly on the delight felt by southerners in euphony and rhythm ; although at the present day the rapturous

delight even of educated Italians in the national poetry is tinged with sensuality. But in ancient times the feeling for euphony and rhythm was far finer and more developed, and demanded satisfaction even in prose, in a still higher degree among the Greeks than among the Romans. Their lively sense of mere euphony is shown, e.g., by the mention in Philostratus of the welcome given in Rome to the Phoenician Hadrianus, professor of eloquence under Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. Knights and senators directed that they should be summoned from the theatre when he began his lectures, and flocked to the Athenaeum, even if they did not understand Greek. People admired his harmonious voice, its cadence, the modulated rhythm of his delivery ; he was listened to with as much delight as the tuneful nightingale.

But apart from all favourable accessory circumstances, the effects of the classical poetry of the Augustan age on the educated world of the period immediately succeeding must have been enormous. This period was essentially unproductive, but possessed the delicate sensitiveness associated with high culture. At such a time, the production of numerous perfect works of art, the establishment of standard forms for its various departments, but above all, the creation of a new poetical language, full of enchanting beauty and dazzling brilliancy, was bound to call forth the instinct of assimilation and imitation most strongly and in the fullest extent. ' All men ', says Goethe, ' have an inexpressible taste for the enjoyment of works of art ; but man learns nothing and enjoys nothing, without at once desiring to produce something himself. This is the most deep-seated peculiarity of human nature ; it is no exaggeration to say that it is human nature itself '. Thus, at every period of high culture, a wide-spread dilettantism is the necessary consequence of a great and abundant development of art. This has been the experience of Germany, especially in the domain of poetry. She has enjoyed a golden age of poetry without parallel, which gave her a poetical language. But succeeding generations displayed an excessive eagerness to obtain assured possession of the precious heritage, by unceasing use and abuse of it, and by continual reproduction. Although we have no express testimony, we may assume a similar state of things for the post-Augustan age. The temptations due to a cultivated language were as irresistible

and the illusions of the *dilettanti* as to the merits of their productions the same as at the present day, and consequently forced the same observations upon the impartial spectators of the literary movement. 'Many', says Petronius, 'have been led astray by poetry. As soon as a man has set a verse upon its legs and has drowned a delicate idea in a flood of words, he thinks he has attained the summit of Helicon'. In addition to this, dilettantism was promoted by the intimate connexion of poetry with the school, the inevitable result of which was that poetical exercises were more or less generally practised, with or without the prompting of the teacher, solely with the object of obtaining more complete mastery over form and of acquiring excellence in a florid and lofty style.

Even those who did not share the delusion of regarding simple reminiscences, the result of study or imitation, as original or their own property, could not help being attracted by the idea of securing for themselves by constant practice the cleverness of form that they had been taught. But no doubt delight in the real or imaginary success of such poetical exercises (which by the way were chiefly responsible for interpolations in the texts of the poets most frequently read) caused many to regard as an end what should only have been a means of study. Even the *Odes* of Horace, almost too severe a critic of his own works, contain many exercises whose only merit is their form. But if Horace, in Quintilian's judgment, was the only Roman lyric poet worth reading, we may assume that the lyric poetry of the post-Augustan age was above all a poetry of schoolboys and *dilettanti*.

The political conditions of the monarchy, the interests and inclinations of different rulers, courts and court-circles, combined with the influences of school and the classical poetry of the Augustan age to turn literary inclinations, tastes, and occupations in the direction of poetry in particular. The universal peace which succeeded the battle of Actium and the decay of political life which came in with the monarchy, almost entirely excluded the Roman people from the two domains on which for so many centuries its intellectual force had displayed such richness and vigour. A mass of talent, vigour and activity, driven out of its natural path by this revolution, now turned its attention to literature. But even here those portions of the field, which under the republic had been most successfully

cultivated, remained only partially open ; freedom of speech was curtailed, the writing of history, up to the time of Nerva and Trajan, who bestowed upon men ' the rare good fortune that they might think what they liked and say what they thought ', was full of danger, even under the tolerant rule of Augustus. Titus Labienus, one of the last of the republicans and an irreconcilable opponent of the new order of things, when he publicly read his history of modern times, omitted considerable portions of it with the words, ' this can be read after my death '. Nevertheless, his work was condemned to be burnt, a sentence hitherto unheard of. Labienus refused to survive its destruction ; he had himself buried alive in the family sepulchre. Eleven years after the death of Augustus, Cremutius Cordus was brought to trial for having called Brutus and Cassius ' the last of the Romans ' in his *Annales ;* he anticipated his certain condemnation by starving himself to death ; his works also were burnt. In such times, poetry offered a doubly welcome refuge to peaceful spirits, who sought an ideal support for life and an escape from reality. But even this refuge was not absolutely safe ; ' the souls of the mighty ' were easily provoked, sometimes by the mere choice of a subject, and by real or seeming allusions to the present. Thus, under Tiberius, the last representative of the noble house of the Scauri brought death upon himself by his tragedy *Atreus*, in which the line, ' The folly of kings must be patiently endured ' was considered specially deserving of punishment. Such dangers, however, rarely threatened poets who were really careful to avoid them and in no way prejudiced the poetical tendencies of the age. Tacitus in his *Dialogus* expressly says that the occupation of poetry is chiefly justified by the fact that it is less likely to cause offence than oratory. Thus poetry especially filled the great gap in the life of Rome caused by the fall of the republic ; and it was by no means a mere result of human caprice, as set forth by Horace in his epistle to Augustus, that the Roman people displayed a zeal for authorship to which they had hitherto been strangers ; sons and austere fathers wreathed their brows, and savants and ignoramuses everywhere took to writing poetry.

The French literature of the first empire offers many parallels to the Roman literature of that time. Fontanes and many other poets ' exhausted their powers in laudations to order

for a fee ' ; those who did not (like Delisle) ' carefully avoided political and social problems and kept to subordinate or indifferent subjects ', which, as it were by way of compensation, they treated in an agreeable manner. The emperor bestowed especial attention upon the theatre. In 1805 two poets were commissioned to ' improve ' Corneille, Racine, and Voltaire ; yet the omission of certain passages only increased their significance. Napoleon allowed no pieces to be performed, the subjects of which were taken from recent times ; the stage ' needed a touch of antiquity ' ; in his opinion the time of Henry IV was not remote enough to avoid exciting passions. Even the *Tiberius* of Joseph Chenier was prohibited, since certain passages could be referred to the present, and in the *Ajax* of Ugo Foscolo the Napoleonic police in Milan (1812) discovered political allusions, which caused the author no slight unpleasantness.

Augustus never entertained the idea of drilling poetry to such a condition of uniformity. He knew how to make it subservient to his aims by frank recognition. The monarch had brought the blessing of 'peace and order ', so long desired ; the next step was to reconcile the educated classes with Caesarism by according protection and encouragement to intellectual efforts, so long as they kept within due bounds ; as for the masses at Rome, the great improvement in their material condition and splendid shows and festivals were ample compensation for the loss of liberty. The interest displayed by Augustus and his circle (Messalla and, above all, Maecenas) in this poetical revival, which was also shared by the ladies of the imperial household, has justly become proverbial. Even more important than the favour of this circle, to which even the captious Asinius Pollio belonged, was the example of its members. Augustus was the most cultivated man of his age ; his interest in literature was sincere, and he showed it not merely by assistance and encouragement, but by openly displayed sympathy with poets and men of letters, whose recitals he listened to ' with patience and good-will '. To him the fourth book of the *Odes* of Horace owed its origin, the *Aeneid* of Virgil its preservation ; it was to him that Horace was allowed to address the *Epistle* containing a comparison between the old and the new poetry. Augustus himself tried his hand at authorship, mostly in prose ; according to Sue-

tonius, 'he only took a superficial interest in poetry'. However, he wrote a long hexameter poem on Sicily, and a small collection of epigrams, which he composed in the bath. He destroyed a tragedy (*Ajax*) before it was finished: 'his *Ajax*', he said, 'had thrown himself on the sponge' (i.e., had been wiped out). This was certainly enough poetry for a statesman on whom the heavy task was imposed of re-organizing the world. Asinius Pollio, Messalla, and Maecenas also wrote verses. The poems of the last-named, according to what we are told, confirm the observation, which applies equally to other branches of art,—that the purest taste and the soundest judgment of the works of others is not always a safeguard against bad taste and affectation in the critic's own attempts. Maecenas's poetical trifles, like everything else of his, were written in a corrupt and bombastic style; Augustus ridiculed the 'perfumed ringlets' of his 'curled' style [1]. Seneca has preserved a specimen, in which this remarkable man describes the love of life with a cynicism worthy of Heine.

Tiberius, who devoted himself with the greatest zeal to the studies necessary for general education, was an admirer of the Alexandrian school; he had a special fondness for the mythological erudition with which they adorned their works. In his Greek poems he imitated Euphorion, Rhianus and Parthenius; he also composed a lyric poem in Latin, an elegy on the death of Lucius Caesar,—an event which brought him, at the age of forty-three, considerably nearer the throne; he also wrote poems of a frivolous kind. A man so gifted and ambitious as Tiberius would hardly have condescended to poetical dilettantism had not his efforts to assimilate the culture of the age as thoroughly as possible, almost forced him to it. The noble Germanicus also during his strenuous life found leisure for poetry; amongst other works he left some Greek comedies. His version of the astronomical didactic poem by Aratus (*Phaenomena*) is still extant. Caligula confined himself to the study of oratory, in which he attained considerable skill; Claudius wrote several learned works, but in prose.

Nero was the first and last emperor who studied poetry not as an exercise or amusement for idle hours, but as a claimant to a prominent position in the poetical world. He never

[1] The Latin words *cincinni* (locks) and *calamistri* (curling irons) are used in the sense of 'ornamental flourishes'.

felt any interest in serious and sound learning, from which his own temperament and his *entourage* dissuaded him. His mother is said to have advised him not to study philosophy, as prejudicial to a future ruler ; his tutor Seneca prevented him from reading ancient literature, so that the pupil's admiration for the works of the master might last the longer. Although both before and after his accession, when in his seventeenth year, he delivered ' declamations ' in the presence of large audiences, he was obliged to have his public speeches written, to the general astonishment ; he was the first emperor who made use of another's pen. But his lack of scientific education proportionately increased the manysidedness of his dilettantism in the fine arts. We have already spoken of his fondness for music, which he considered his forte ; he dallied with the chisel and modeller's stick, and wrote poems as enthusiastically as he sang and played musical instruments. His poetical efforts, according to Tacitus, were intended to counterbalance, in public opinion, the bad effect of his other less seemly artistic exercises. It is doubtful whether he possessed any, or how much, real talent for poetry. Tacitus denies it to him altogether. According to that historian, ' he surrounded himself with persons who possessed a certain facility in writing verses, but had not yet made a name for themselves. These persons met, strung together the verses they had brought with them or threw off on the spot, and worked up the emperor's chance utterances into a whole. This is shown by the character of these poems, which possess neither vigour nor originality, nor uniformity of style '. It may be confidently assumed, that this was the origin of many of the poems of distinguished *dilettanti* (e.g., the ' little love-poems ' dictated by them after their meals on couches of citrus-wood), since in all branches of learning the productions of clients, slaves and freedmen were regarded by persons of quality as their own property, which they had a perfect right to make use of. In the poems of Lucius Verus, again, everything good was credited to his gifted friends. It is true, on the other hand, that in this matter Suetonius defends Nero, asserting that he had no need to deck himself in borrowed plumes, since verses flowed from him with ease. Nero's compositions, written by his own hand, were evidently (if we may believe Suetonius, who had inspected them) neither imitations nor copies, but all original, judging by

the numerous erasures, corrections and insertions. Nero's poems were numerous and of various kinds : little trifles (e.g., on Poppaea's ' amber-hair '), satires, lyrics to be sung to the accompaniment of the *cithara* (including probably solos from tragedies), a long epic called *Troica*, in which the chief hero was Paris, who, without revealing his identity, defeated all comers, including Hector himself, in a wrestling bout ; another contemplated epic, containing a complete history of Rome from the earliest times, does not appear to have been finished. Martial, who as a rule has nothing but abuse for Nero, concedes some merit to his poems. Some lines, accidentally preserved, on the course of the River Tigris, at least show a certain dexterity in versification.

Musical contests formed the chief item in the programme of the festival first instituted by Nero after a Greek model, which was intended to be held every five years, but seems to have only taken place on two occasions (in 61 and 65). Its apologists were of opinion that the victories of orators and poets would stimulate talent. But as a matter of fact Nero wanted to be the only poetical and musical star in these contests ; the participation in them of persons of distinction at his wish was only intended to enhance his reputation ; it was to him that the crown was awarded. At the second festival he gave a reading of the *Troica*. He allowed no poetical rival near his throne. Lucan, whom he had admitted into his poetical circle, soon aroused his jealousy ; when present at a reading by the poet, he ostentatiously withdrew and apparently forbade him to recite again in public (end of 62 or beginning of 63). Lucan, carried away into open hostility to the court, joined Piso in his conspiracy, and paid the penalty of death on its discovery. But, however dangerous it was in the time of Nero to claim any reputation as a poet, it was advisable—even necessary, for all who had anything to do with him, to make a show of sympathy and liking for poetry, and as far as possible to provide a foil for Nero's poetical efforts by their own. No one who knows the history of that period, can doubt that this feeling produced a greatly increased activity in the domain of poetry. It was one of the reproaches levelled against Seneca by his enemies, that he wrote verses more frequently and enthusiastically, from the time that Nero showed a fondness for the poetic art.

A complete change took place under Vespasian, who, although no poet himself, liberally encouraged talent of all kinds, including poetical. Titus, who had lived at Nero's court as a boy, had a facile gift for Latin and Greek poetry, even for improvisation; amongst other things, he described a comet 'in a splendid poem', as the elder Pliny calls it; he is also mentioned as a poet by the younger Pliny. In many respects under Domitian the conditions of the time of Nero were repeated; certainly, men's minds felt the weight of an even more terrible oppression, but poetical efforts were honestly favoured and encouraged, above all by the Capitoline competition (founded in 86) at which genius was allowed free scope. On the whole, this second Nero laid no claim, as emperor, to poetical fame, although during his enforced leisure when only a prince he had pretended a zealous devotion to poetry. Of course, at his court his youthful poetical efforts were declared to be unsurpassable. Quintilian says that the gods considered it too paltry an honour for him to be merely the greatest poet; therefore, they handed over to him the care of the universe, in order to divert his attention from such an occupation. It is doubtful whether he even began an epic on the Jewish war, mentioned by Valerius Flaccus, but it is certain that the fight for the Capitol in December, 69, during which his life was in peril, was the subject of a poem by him; Martial in 89 mentions the 'heavenly poem of the Capitoline war'. It would seem, therefore, that Domitian was by no means averse from being reminded of his poetical efforts, although he had quite given them up; and Martial does homage to him as 'the lord of the sisters nine'.

Poets also claimed Domitian's successor Nerva as one of themselves; Pliny mentions him amongst the writers of amusing and wanton trifles. Martial styles him 'the Tibullus of our age'—an expression borrowed from a poem by Nero, to whose circle Nerva had once belonged; Martial's epigrams on him, written with all the humility of a client, show that even during his last days, Domitian liked to be considered a poet.

There was no poetical fibre in Trajan's soldierly nature; he seems to have been absolutely indifferent to poetry; Hadrian on the other hand, the most versatile *dilettante* who ever occupied the Roman throne, wrote verse (including indecent

DOMINICAN COLLEGE LIBRARY SAN RAFAEL, CALIF.

poems) and prose equally well ; some of his trifles have been preserved. Even on his deathbed, whimsical as ever, he wrote the famous lines, which according to his biographer are an average specimen of his poetry—

> ' Soul of mine, pretty one, flitting one,
> Guest and partner of my clay,
> Whither wilt thou hie away,—
> Pallid one, rigid one, naked one,—
> Never to play again, never to play ? '
> (*C. Merivale.*)

Hadrian's example seems to have made poetry the fashion at his court. His adopted son, Aelius Verus, was a skilled versifier ; Lucius Verus, who was adopted at his suggestion by Antoninus Pius, also devoted himself to poetry in his early years, as already mentioned. Marcus Aurelius also, at the age of twenty-two, had written hexameters, of which he thought so highly that they were not in danger, like his other attempts, of being committed to the flames.

Here this series of imperial poets, almost without a parallel in history and literature, comes to an end, and poetry for a long time was an exile from the court of Rome. The next emperor who is said to have written verses (Greek) was Alexander Severus, whose education and poetical dilettantism (like that of Balbinus, the two elder Gordians, Gallienus and Numerian) show that even in the third century the old literary traditions and intellectual sympathies still survived in some of the highest circles, like islands amidst the ever-rising flood of barbarism.

During the period from Augustus to Hadrian, the ruling princes, some before and others after their accession, were nearly all poetical amateurs. This very exceptional phenomenon is undoubtedly no more the result of chance than the fact that, from the Antonines to Alexander Severus, we do not find a single imperial poet, although the emperors during that interval were for the most part highly educated. A more probable explanation is that both the later and the earlier emperors simply shared the prevailing tendencies and interests of their time, and that their attitude towards poetry was essentially the same as that of their educated contemporaries. Hence we may assume with certainty a very general diffusion of poetical dilettantism in the cultured circles of the first

century, and an equally striking decline towards the middle of the second.

In fact, there is no doubt that in the time of Hadrian, a new intellectual movement, which arrested the poetical tendencies of the first century, obtained the upper hand. The history of Roman poetry up to about 100 A.D. was as rich in names as it was poor, if not absolutely barren, in later times. The explanation of this is not to be looked for in the decay of creative power or original genius, which Gibbon regards as one of the characteristic phenomena of the second century; the poets of the age immediately succeeding the Augustan were nothing but highly educated and gifted *dilettanti* (in the best sense of the word): and even in later times there was by no means a dearth of poets. Undoubtedly, the decline of poetical aspirations was in a measure due to the domination of antiquarianism over literature, since the study of ancient authors could not offer the same stimulus to original or reproductive effort as that of modern poets. Consequently the influence which the application of the emperors to poetry (although simply the result of the prevailing tendency of the age) exercised upon the upper classes by force of example, disappeared, and with it an important inducement to poetical dilettantism. But the chief reason for the decline is to be looked for in the great impression produced by the highly artistic prose of the sophists, which had its origin on Greek soil; it provoked the admiration of the Romans and found many imitators amongst the more impressionable. Lastly, it must never be forgotten that, chiefly owing to the new organization introduced by Hadrian, the empire was gradually developed into a military and bureaucratic state, which claimed greater powers and held out to its functionaries more brilliant prospects in their official career; the result was that talent and ambition turned their attention from *belles-lettres* in general to military service, administration and the study of the law. Eloquence, however, was still generally cultivated, but rather as a means than as an end, and in a different manner; special branches of learning, especially philology, which was closely connected with the now reviving jurisprudence, were also eagerly studied.

The new importance acquired by poetry and literature generally on the establishment of the monarchy is shown

chiefly in three things : the development of an extensive book-trade and the foundation of public libraries ; the institution of public readings of recent works (*recitationes*) ; and, lastly, the establishment of an entirely new honour for poets—the crown of gold. The last dates from the reigns of Nero and Domitian ; the other institutions go back as far as Augustus.

Even when Cicero was a young man, the elements of a book-trade must have been in existence in Rome. His friend Atticus, the first person who is known to have undertaken the multiplication and sale of books on a large scale, had numerous rivals. Under Augustus at the latest, the book-trade in Rome was a business by itself, and soon after in the provinces. The retail shops, situated in the liveliest quarters of the capital, had their pillars and entrances decorated with notices and copies of books for sale, and formed, as in modern Rome, a meeting-place for the friends of literature, who came to inspect the new books or to have a chat. Thanks to slave labour, this industry was able to furnish its wares promptly, cheaply, and on a large scale. Hundreds of scribes, writing from dictation at the same time, did the work of a modern press. Even if they did not take much longer time, the result was very unsatisfactory ; incorrectness was the chief fault of ancient books. Since two hours was enough for taking down Martial's second book, a complete copy of his epigrams could have been turned out in a little more than seventeen hours ; a bookseller, who could employ fifty scribes at once, was consequently able to produce an edition of 1,000 copies comfortably in a month. The mention of such an edition of a pamphlet of entirely personal and ephemeral interest, published at the writer's own expense, justifies us in assuming that big booksellers must have brought out much larger editions of favourite and superior works.

In our days we are too much inclined to underestimate the productive power of writing, as compared with that of the press. Yet it has been shown on various occasions, when copy not print was necessary, that the difference between the two is less than is generally imagined. About 2,000 copies of Voltaire's *La Pucelle* were distributed in Paris in a month. Of Burgos's two-sheet memorandum to Ferdinand VII (January, 1826), 5,000 copies are said to have been circulated in Spain. On the second day after A. Oppermann had received the first

copy, thousands of copies of the protest of the Göttingen Seven [1] were in existence. Kossuth successfully distributed throughout Hungary his *Reichstagszeitung*, which he was not allowed to print. Thanks to the comprehensive organization, the fruit of many centuries of experience, and the employment of slave labour, the multiplication of MS. copies in antiquity must have been far greater. The circulation of books in distant lands soon followed. Cicero says that the depositions of the witnesses in the Catilinarian process were copied by all the clerks, circulated in Rome, distributed throughout Italy, and sent to all the provinces, so that there was no place in the Roman empire which they had not reached. According to Pliny, Varro had conferred a kind of omnipresence on the 700 persons, whose portraits were included in his illustrated biographies, by sending the work into all parts of the world. Sulpicius Severus's life of St. Martinus of Tours, which Paulinus, bishop of Trèves, had brought to Rome, was at once in general request, and the booksellers were delighted with the good business they did ; 'for nothing commanded a readier sale, or fetched a higher price'. A friend of the author, who visited Africa, found that it had preceded him and was being read throughout Carthage. Going on to Alexandria, he found it in everybody's hands there as well, and also all over Egypt, in the Natron Valley and the Thebaid ; he even saw an old man reading it in the desert.

The prices of books were not high. The price of the first book of Martial (118 epigrams, 700 lines), elegantly got up, was 5 denarii (about 4*s.*), cheaper editions 6 to 10 sesterces (about 1*s.* 2*d.* to 2*s.*) ; his *Xenia* (274 lines under 127 headings) was sold by Tryphon the bookseller for 4 sesterces (about 10*d.*), too high a price according to Martial, who maintained that it could be sold at half the price for a profit. It fills fourteen pages in the Teubner edition, and since the price probably included what answered to our 'binding', the transcription of the text perhaps did not cost much more than at the present day in Germany, where an ordinary sheet can be printed for about 3½*d.* The text of a little book sent by Statius to Plotius Grypus, written by the poet himself, cost nothing, the purple cover, the new paper, and the two knobs (*umbilici*)

[1] Seven professors who were dismissed in 1837 for having signed a protest against the abolition of the Hanoverian constitution.

at the end of the stick, round which the roll was wound, 10 *ases* (about 6*d.*). Spoilt paper found its way into the schools, where the boys utilized the clean backs of the sheets for their exercises, and into the grocery and provision shops, where it was used for making bags for pepper and incense, or for wrapping up salt fish.

But everybody also had free access to collections of literary works in both Greek and Latin. Julius Caesar's plan of founding public libraries in Rome was frustrated by his death ; but it was carried out by Asinius Pollio, to whom Rome was indebted for its first public library (Greek and Latin). Augustus added two more (one on the Palatine, the other in the portico of Octavia), and later emperors (especially Vespasian and Trajan) continually increased the number, so that in the fourth century no fewer than twenty-eight were in existence. Naturally, the libraries were also used as meeting places for the friends of literature. Asinius Pollio was also the first to utilize the rooms for rendering homage to literary celebrities in a manner before unknown. Their statues, with boxes of books at their feet (such as those we possess of Sophocles and others), or busts crowned with ivy, ' the reward of the poet ', some of bronze and others of gold and silver, adorned the halls and porticoes. In Asinius Pollio's library Varro's was the only likeness of a living celebrity ; but the honour appears to have soon become very general. Sidonius Apollinaris in the fifth century could boast that his statue was to be seen among those of other literary men in Trajan's library.

Nevertheless, the general accessibility to standard (preferably older) works in the public libraries, and the activity of the book trade, which did its utmost to promote the circulation of the most recent books, were not enough to bring authors and public together, at a time when literary life was extremely rich and animated, and a general and lively interest was taken in literature. The public was still so accustomed to *viva voce* recitation, that reading never became so general as in modern times, since, without punctuation or the separation of words, frequent abbreviations, bad writing and incorrect texts nearly always made it a trouble instead of a pleasure. Poetry (especially lyric) lost most by not being heard ; since it was intended either to be sung to a musical accompaniment, or at least for a musical recital or something like it. Euphony

and rhythm were its most essential characteristics, and were most generally and keenly appreciated ; hence poems, which were read instead of being recited, seemed to lack reality ; even prose, when simply read, lost its effect, though not to the same extent. When Juvenal tells us that the announcement of a reading of the *Thebaid* of Statius by its author drew crowds to hear the pleasant voice and the favourite poem, it is clear that the voice formed part of the attraction. In the hellenistic period also, the works of poets and historians were intended for public rather than for private reading. Asinius Pollio, by the introduction of recitations (i.e., readings of new works before large and specially invited audiences), undoubtedly met a generally felt want. The ever-increasing public, which took the liveliest interest in the most recent productions of literature, became acquainted with them at first hand and in an indisputably authentic form, and at the same time satisfied its natural curiosity as to the personality of the author. Of course, literary men and poets were equally pleased to make their bow to the public in person, to convince themselves of the effect produced by their works, to profit by the criticism of the learned, but above all, to be able to enjoy to the fullest extent the approval of their contemporaries.

Owing to the crowd of idlers, who were delighted at every fresh chance of filling up their spare time, the number of *dilettanti* and poetasters, who sought above all the satisfaction of their vanity and of course expected from others the indulgence and favour which dilettantism lavishes upon itself, the rapid degeneration of this new institution was unavoidable. 'You want me to read you my epigrams, Celer ?' runs an epigram of Martial ; 'I won't. You don't want to hear, but to recite yourself'. While *dilettanti*, such as Pliny the younger, even during the most beautiful weather, never tired of attending recitations every day and lavishing their applause, it was the real poets who suffered most from this ever-increasing mania for reading. Horace's greatest terror was the poet in his frenzy ; 'he rages like a bear, who has managed to break the bars of his cage ; the savage reciter puts the learned and unlearned to flight ; when he has caught a man, he holds him fast and puts him to death with his reading, like a leech which will not let go the skin until it has sucked its fill of blood'. 'The reciter', says Seneca, 'brings an enormous historical

work, written very small, tightly folded together ; after he has read a considerable part of it, he says, " I will stop now, if you like ". Immediately there is a shout of " Read ! read ! " from his hearers, who would really like to see him struck dumb on the spot '. One of the characters of the Petronian romance is an old man, possessed by a mania for improvising and reciting, who in face of death on a sinking ship continues to bawl out verses and to write them on a huge sheet of parchment. In all frequented places—porticoes, baths, theatres—he at once begins to recite, although everywhere pelted with stones. The poet with his manuscript, says Martial, is more fearful and more feared than the tigress robbed of her young, the poisonous snake or the scorpion. He holds his victim fast in the street, follows him into the bath, to table, to his study, and wakes him from his sleep. Wherever he shows himself, men shun his luxurious table as the sungod turned away in disgust from the meal set before him by Thyestes, and solitude reigns around him. Martial is also of opinion that the imperial spectacles in the amphitheatre satisfied the ears even more than the eyes of the public ; for as long as they lasted, the poets amongst the spectators could not recite. One of the reasons whch, according to Juvenal, drove his friend Umbricius from Rome, in addition to the continual fires and collapse of houses, was the recitations of the poets in the month of August ; in an outburst of comic despair, he describes how he himself, to obtain revenge for this torture, decided for his part not to spare the paper, which others were sure to spoil, since the place was swarming with poets.

While the vanity of poets led them to test the patience of their hearers by frequent and lengthy recitations, they only too often had recourse to all kinds of theatrical affectation, in the effort to exhibit themselves and their work in the most favourable light. The great importance attached to a fine delivery, suitable gesticulation and other externalities was sufficient to account for this. Quintilian gives detailed instructions for the oratorical debutant : on the training and necessary qualities of the voice, the compass of which ought to include the whole scale of sounds ; how to avoid monotony and the extremes of treble and bass at the same time. He warns him against the sing-song delivery which was the great fault of the orators of the day, and treats in equal detail of

gesticulation and dumb show, dress and outward appearance, for which he recommends instruction not only from a musician but also from an actor. Of course all these and similar rules were equally applicable to the reciter. When the younger Pliny discovered that he read poetry badly, he decided to have his poems read before an audience of friends by one of his freedmen ; he was in doubt, however, whether he ought to behave as a disinterested spectator, or like many others express his opinion by murmurs, gesticulation, or facial play ; but as he thought he was as poor at dumb-show as at reading, he begged Suetonius to help him out of the difficulty by his advice. Persius describes the affectation of reciters who, in a snowy white holiday *toga*, with well-curled hair and a huge diamond ring on their finger, took their seat on a high chair ; then, with languishing looks, their neck rocking backwards and forwards, they began to recite in melting tones, the result of long practice in solfaing. Sometimes they wore a woollen neckcloth, to spare their voice or show that they were hoarse ; as a matter of fact, thinks Martial, this only showed that they were as incapable of speech as of silence.

The manner in which the readers presented themselves before the public and the applause of their hearers were reminiscent of the theatre. Although the majority of the audience, invited personally or by letter, were friends or, at least, too polite not to be lavish of their applause, especially if they were themselves authors and looked forward to similar treatment at their own recitals, many, perhaps most, readers were careful to provide themselves with a reserve of hired *claqueurs*. In Trajan's time, the practice was common also amongst advocates ; it is possible that the pernicious custom may have crept into the law-courts owing to the widespread influence of the recitations. One of the poet's patrons lent him the services of some loud-voiced freedmen, who posted themselves in suitable places, especially at the ends of the benches, and at a sign from the 'leader of the chorus' (*mesochorus*), burst into shouts of applause. Sometimes, persons in the audience itself were enlisted for the purpose by the present of an old cloak, the promise of a good dinner (such were called *laudiceni*, those who gave their applause in return for a dinner), or the offer of a sum of money, which was paid quite openly in the basilicas. Pliny

relates that two of his youngest slaves had been thus engaged for three *denarii* apiece ; the rate of pay no doubt varied according to the ability of the *claqueur*, special importance being attached to the modulation of the voice. Thus, the recitations were accompanied, on the part of the audience, by clapping of hands, acclamations of all kinds, and gestures of delight ; people rose to express their admiration of the reader, and kissed their hands to him.

But not even the liveliest interest, the best intentions and the greatest desire to be civil could prevent the majority of the audience from showing annoyance at the continual round of recitations, which often lasted whole days, even in the hottest months of the year (July and August). Certainly Pliny, whose enthusiasm for literature and the literary profession knew no bounds, never got tired himself and rarely refused an invitation to a reading ; but he admitted that there were disquieting symptoms. He writes as follows : ' This year (97) has produced a plentiful crop of poets ; during the whole month of April scarcely a day has passed on which we have not been entertained with the recital of some poem. It is a pleasure to find that a taste for polite literature still exists, and that men of genius *do* come forward and make themselves known, notwithstanding the lazy attendance they get for their pains. The greater part of the audience sit in the lounging-places, gossip away their time there and are perpetually sending to inquire whether the author has made his entrance yet, whether he has got through the preface, or whether he has almost finished the piece. Then at length they saunter in with an air of the greatest indifference, nor do they condescend to stay through the recital, but go out before it is over, some slily and stealthily, others again with perfect freedom and unconcern. . . . Were one to bespeak the attendance of the idlest man living and remind him of the appointment ever so often, or ever so long beforehand, either he would not come at all, or if he did would grumble about having lost a day, for no other reason but because he had *not* lost it. So much the more do those authors deserve our encouragement and applause, who have resolution to persevere in their studies and to read out their compositions in spite of this apathy or arrogance on the part of their audience ' (Melmoth's translation).

On another occasion, Pliny indignantly writes to a friend that recently, while an excellent work was being read, two or three of the audience sat in their places as if they were deaf and dumb. What laziness! what impertinence! what indecency! indeed, what madness to spend the whole day in insulting a man, and to leave an enemy instead of a friend!

Certainly, Epictetus's rule, not to accept invitations to readings without due consideration, was by no means unnecessary; but if one did attend, he ought to maintain an attitude of dignity and reserve and avoid giving offence. Pliny was a model of punctilious courtesy. He relates how, after a recitation, he went up to the youthful poet, embraced him, heaped praises upon him, and encouraged him to persevere in his profession. 'The family—the mother and brother of the young man were also present; the brother, at first anxious then joyful, had excited general attention by his deep and lively interest in the performance. Then Pliny also congratulated them and, after reaching home, wrote one of his elegant notes on this trifling event, which spread abroad the news of the young poet's success'. Such a reading was an event which formed the subject of conversation in literary circles during the next few days; then the poem was taken up by the booksellers, who pushed its circulation.

Considering the great importance of recitations in the literary life of Rome, it may be assumed that the emperors frequently honoured them with their presence. Augustus, as already mentioned, set the example; Claudius, after his accession, had a reader to recite his numerous works. Nero, soon after he became emperor, recited his poems himself in the theatre; this caused such delight, that a festival of thanksgiving was ordained and the poems, inscribed in letters of gold, were dedicated to Jupiter in his temple on the Capitol. Domitian, while prince, also recited in public. Dating from the second century, readings seem to have chiefly taken place in the Athenaeum, where a space in the form of an amphitheatre was reserved for the purpose. Pertinax, on the very day of his murder, had intended to be present there at a poetical recitation; and Alexander Severus frequently formed one of the audience at the lectures and recitations of Greek rhetoricians and poets.

In the middle ages, also, even after the invention of print-

ing, poets and literary men often made their works known by recitations. Thus Giraldus Cambrensis (Girald de Barri) in the year 1200 after his return from Ireland publicly read his *Topography* of the island at Oxford. The *Rederijkkamers* (poetical guilds of the Netherlands) and the Italian Academies of the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries may also be compared with the old Roman recitations. Boiardo read *Orlando innamorato* at the court of Ferrara, and Madame de Sévigné speaks of readings of Racine and other classical authors. Lastly, the introduction of the Greek custom of regularly recurring poetical competitions at Rome opened up to poets the alluring prospect of being crowned, an honour never before heard of, and thus gave an entirely new stimulus to poetical ambition. For Greek poetry there already existed such a competition in the *Augustalia* at Naples, founded in honour of Augustus (A.D. 2) and held every four years, which was considered by the Greek world one of the most brilliant and famous festivals of its kind. Here Claudius, who appeared in Greek dress for the occasion, ordered a Greek comedy to be performed, written by his brother Germanicus, whose memory he always honoured in every possible way. He awarded the prize to it in accordance with the decision of the judges. Statius also once received a prize (a crown of ears of corn) at Naples. At Rome the first poetical contest was that instituted by Nero, which, as already remarked, was only intended for his own glorification, and exercised little or no influence on Roman poetry.

The Capitoline *agon*, instituted by Domitian in 86, and held every four years, acquired all the more importance. The competition for the prize in Greek and Latin eloquence (a stock subject being the praise of the Capitoline Jupiter), which at first formed part of the proceedings, was soon discontinued. On the other hand, the prize for Greek and Latin poetry, which was unique of its kind, continued to be the highest aim of poetical ambition throughout the empire; and the hope of receiving the wreath of oak leaves, amidst the liveliest manifestations of sympathy, from the hand of the emperor himself, after the judges had delivered their verdict, induced the most gifted poets from distant provinces to cross the seas to Rome. If unsuccessful, they could console themselves with the reflection that no provincial was ever allowed to obtain prizes at

Rome ; at least, the African Publius Annius Florus, who failed in one of the first competitions with a poem on the Dacian triumph, assures us that the audience had unanimously demanded the prize for him, but that the emperor had refused it, to prevent the crown of the great Jupiter being carried off to Africa. Of course it was frequently discussed in literary circles at Rome, who was going to win the crown at the next competition. Statius (probably in 94) was an unsuccessful candidate. A certain Collinus, to whom it appears to have been awarded in 86, is absolutely unknown ; of the tragic poet Scaevus (or Scaevius) Memor, a brother of the satiric poet Turnus, who received it under Domitian, hardly anything is known but the name.

The grave of a Roman boy, apparently the son of a freedman, named Quintus Sulpicius Maximus, who died early in his twelfth year, has been discovered at Rome. According to the inscription on his tomb, he competed for the prize at the Capitoline *agon* in the year 94 with fifty-two Greek poets : ' owing to the talent he displayed, the favour which his tender years aroused became admiration ; he came out of the contest with honour '. The 43 Greek hexameters, improvised by him on the theme, ' What Zeus said when he reproached Helios for lending his chariot to Phaethon ' (probably a common subject in the rhetorical schools), were engraved upon the monument, ' that it might not be thought that the parents were influenced in their judgment by their affection ' ; they give evidence of a diligent study of Greek epic. Of two Greek epigrams in praise of the deceased, one asserts that sickness and exhaustion carried him off, since he devoted himself day and night to the Muses. In 110, the thirteen year old Lucius Valerius Pudens of Histonium, as already noticed, was unanimously awarded the prize. We know nothing of later coronations of poets, although they probably took place regularly every fourth year, until the last days of antiquity.

Further, the externalities of the festival sufficiently demonstrated its Greek character, at least in the time of Domitian. The emperor presided, wearing a Greek purple cloak and Greek shoes, a golden crown on his head, adorned with the images of the three Capitoline divinities—Jupiter, Juno and Minerva. The judges and assessors consisted of the *flamen dialis* (priest of Jupiter) and the priestly college of the Flavian

house, similarly attired, except that their crowns, in accordance with hellenistic and Alexandrian custom, also displayed the image of the emperor. Later, the priestly colleges took it in turns to direct the competitions, under the presidency of the emperor. The brilliancy and solemnity of this festal gathering, the presence of the highest personages of the court and dignitaries of the empire, the bestowal of the crown by the emperor himself, the world-wide historical importance of the place—all combined to make the honour of coronation something unique of its kind. The memory of it survived till the middle ages, and the custom was revived in the cities of Italy from the end of the thirteenth century. At Padua and Prato, poets were crowned before Petrarch, and Dante, when in exile, hoped to receive the honour in the chapel of St. John at Florence. Petrarch, in his retirement at Vaucluse, when simultaneously invited by the university of Paris and the senate of Rome to receive the crown of laurel in public, decided in favour of Rome, 'where the ashes of the great poets of antiquity were buried'. On Easter Sunday, April 8, 1341, he was solemnly crowned on the Capitol, in the hall of the senate, by the senator Ursus; after the conclusion of the ceremony, the poet went in procession to St. Peter's, where he humbly deposited the laurel on the altar of the chief of the apostles.

Besides the Capitoline, Domitian held another competition yearly on March 19, a festival of Minerva, the object of special worship at his country seat near Alba. One of the members of a college founded by the emperor, elected by lot to preside, superintended the arrangements; in addition to theatrical representations and magnificent combats of wild beasts, there were oratorical and poetical competitions. It was here that Statius (before the year 94) received the golden crown of olive for his poems on the German and Dacian campaigns—a prize of course not so highly esteemed as the Capitoline crown of natural oak leaves. No doubt the festival ceased with Domitian's death. Nothing definite is known of other poetical competitions in the later days of Rome, nor of the revival of the Neronian *agon* by Gordian III and the poetical *agones* in other cities and the provinces; but we may assume that their number was considerable. Eumolpus in Petronius says he is a poet and no mean one, 'at least, if the crown is worth any-

thing, although certainly it is sometimes bestowed by favour upon those who do not deserve it'. A Roman knight of Beneventum is described in the inscription on his grave as a 'Latin poet, crowned at the festival in his native town'. As late as the end of the fourth century, poets, as well as athletes and musicians, took part in the Pythian *agon* at Carthage, as is shown by Augustine's mention of his own coronation as a poet by the proconsul.

During these two centuries, then, poets had ample opportunity of being heard and becoming famous, and obtained applause, honour, reputation and public sympathy, to an even greater extent than at any other time. On the other hand, poetry did not secure material advantages, such as an income, since the booksellers of course paid no fees or royalties, at a time when the idea of literary ownership was unknown, and when neither they nor the author were in any way legally protected. The exemption from public duties and charges, enjoyed by teachers and physicians, did not extend to poets (according to a rescript of the Emperor Philip). A wealthy poet might certainly remain content with fame, like Lucan, who rested on his laurels in gardens adorned with marble, or the consul Silius Italicus, who devoted only the evening of his life to poetry, in his villas magnificently decorated with numerous statues and busts, on the delightful coast of Campania. Otherwise, it was extremely hazardous for a man who had no assured means of existence to make poetry the serious business of his life. Nevertheless, the number of those whom confidence in their talents (real or imaginary) led to adopt it as their profession, was evidently very large; indeed, it could not be otherwise, considering the unusual number of powerful inducements and temptations to poetry. Few, however, were successful, and those who despised this art which failed to provide bread and cheese, practical, matter-of-fact individuals, were able to appeal to the miserable condition of the majority of poets and their own complaints. Ovid refused to give up poetry, in spite of his father's exhortations to abandon an occupation which was so unprofitable that even Homer left no fortune; but, although he had enough to live on, he nevertheless complained of the poet's lot. Formerly, in the good old days of Ennius, the name of poet was honoured and respected, and wealth was his in abundance; now poetry has

fallen into disrepute, and the service of the Muse is reviled as idleness.

If this complaint could be made at the most brilliant period of Roman poetry by one of its most celebrated representatives, it is evident that poetry and poets were at all times regarded with widespread contempt by Romans of the old stamp. In the *Dialogus* of Tacitus, also, this view of poetry is chiefly insisted upon; little is said in its praise. In addition to the fame that it may bring, it is reckoned one of the chief blessings of the poet's life that, far removed from the cares and stress, the crime and bustle of the world, he can pass his life in seclusion in the midst of nature, in the solitude of forests and groves, while his mind can take refuge in the haunts of purity and innocence, on consecrated ground. But this was just what a man ought not to do, according to Tacitus's view of life, although he does not show so pronounced an aversion from poetry as its regular opponent in the dialogue. The latter is made to say that poems and verses confer no dignity upon their author, nor any lasting advantage; all that he obtains is the brief satisfaction of idle and useless praise. Even if he has taken a whole year, working day and night, to complete a single poem, he has further to run about everywhere, begging people to condescend to come and hear it. Nor can this be done without money. He has to rent a house, to prepare a reading-room, to hire benches and send round invitations. Even if the reading is successful beyond his expectations, his reward only lasts a day or two; all that he gets by it is vague applause, empty words, and a brief, momentary pleasure. Even the fame of the poet is worth little; mediocrities have no readers, the best but few. The fame of a reading very rarely extends throughout the city, to say nothing of the provinces. Very few of those who come to Rome from distant provinces, such as Spain and Asia Minor, visit the most celebrated poets in person; or, if they do, they are satisfied with a passing acquaintance. How different, in all respects, is the position of an eminent orator, who acquires wealth, honour, influence and a world-wide reputation. Eumolpus in Petronius, who boasts of being a poet whose merits are recognized, when asked why he is so badly dressed, answers: 'For that very reason!' Martial also advises a friend to abandon Helicon, which has nothing to offer except loud but empty applause,

and to turn his attention to the *forum* : ' there is to be heard the chink of ready money ; but round our unprofitable chairs and platforms, nothing but the sound of kisses thrown by the audience '. If you meet people in threadbare cloaks in the streets of Rome, you may be sure that they are the Ovids and Virgils of the time ; the upright, the learned, and the amiable walk about shivering in a brown hood, simply because they are guilty of the crime of being poets ; if a son writes verses, his father makes haste to repudiate him.

The most detailed account of the miseries of a poet's life is to be found in Juvenal. Before the emperor (Hadrian) looked favourably upon the sorrowing Muses, things had reached such a pitch at Rome that even well-known and famous poets had to try the lowest means of getting a bare subsistence, such as hiring a bathroom at Gabii, a bakery at Rome, or acting as criers at auctions. The rich were lavish of nothing but their praises. If a poet went to pay his respects to a wealthy patron, he was told that he was writing verses himself and acknowledged Homer alone as his superior by reason of his antiquity. The rich never wanted money for their luxuries ; they always had enough to feed a tame lion, but there was nothing left for the poet, as if he had the larger maw. At most they would lend him an empty house, long since bolted and barred, with walls covered with mildew, to hold a reading in, but they would not give him even the money to pay for the erection of the platform or the hire of the seats and benches. But what good was a brilliant reputation to the poor poet, if it meant nothing else ? Even the celebrated Statius would have had nothing to eat, if he had not disposed of his unacted *Agave* to Paris.[1] And yet the pestilent itch for writing is incurable in many, and lasts till old age, though their heart be sick with waiting ; poets still compose sublime verses in their garret, by the light of a solitary lamp, on the chance of seeing their lean features immortalized in an ivy-crowned portrait-bust. But how can the mind soar to poetic enthusiasm, while the starving body calls aloud day and night for the satisfaction of its needs ? The mind of a man who does not know how he is to get a blanket cannot feel the divine afflatus ; even Virgil's imagination would have been paralyzed, if he

1 A famous pantomime and dancer. Agāvē tore her son Pentheus to pieces at a festival of Dionysus on Mount Cithaeron, as described in the *Bacchae* of Euripides.

had not had a slave to wait on him and tolerable quarters. How absurd to ask a Rubrenus Lappa to rise to the level of the buskin of the ancients, when he has been obliged to pawn his dishes and his cloak, before he could write his tragedy *Atreus*. Only a mind free from all earthly anxieties, filled with longing for the solitude of the woods, the grottoes and the fountains of the Muses, can gain admission to the ranks of true poets. Thus the years that should have been devoted to agriculture or service in the army or the navy, are passed in fruitless efforts; a needy and destitute old age approaches, and the poet curses himself and his profession, although men speak well of him. Formerly it was different: in the time of the Maecenases, Cottas, and Fabii it was an advantage to many to look pale, and to remain sober during the Saturnalia. Then paleness was regarded as an attribute as necessary to learned men, especially poets, as his beard to the philosopher; when Oppian looked ill, says Martial, he began to write verses.

But apart from the fact that Juvenal everywhere exaggerates, his description is by no means correct, since he represents poverty and want as the unavoidable and exclusive lot of the poet, unless he has private means or is willing to work at a trade. Certainly, in this case, as at all times when literary production cannot be made immediately profitable, poets were entirely dependent upon the favour and generosity of the wealthy and influential, which, however, they probably then enjoyed to a greater extent than at any other time. For it was the general opinion throughout the Greek and Roman world that wealth, rank and position imposed great obligations, and especially that the possession of a large fortune required not merely a proportionate expenditure in the public service, but also a generous distribution of superfluous wealth amongst the poor. Princely generosity was especially expected from the great men of Rome; and at a time when interest in poetry was so keen and general, this was bound to be particularly advantageous to the poet. Certainly, charity was not practised on so large a scale as formerly. Even the younger Pliny laments that the good old custom of rewarding poets for their eulogies with a sum of money, had gradually fallen into disuse; he himself, however, still kept it up, and thought it his duty to pay Martial's travelling expenses home in return for a very flattering poem.

Martial had a number of other generous patrons. Even Juvenal's complaints of the stinginess of the rich show that it was always considered to a certain extent one of their duties to assist poets, and that neglect to do so excited dissatisfaction in literary circles and brought them into disrepute.

On the other hand, it was by no means the poets alone who were benefited by this state of things; they might even return the favour with interest, for honour and fame in the present and immortality in the future were regarded as the highest of blessings by the men of that age; and who was better able to bestow them than the poet? But even during their lifetime, great men looked to poetry for guidance, as elevating and glorifying every important event. The idea that even the most favoured existence lacked something without the adornment of poetry, was widespread and never entirely disappeared, although it gradually became rare. In this sense those most highly placed felt the need of the poet and were quite ready, in their own interest, to lay him under obligations to secure his devotion. Naturally, of course, the number of poets who sought favour and generosity was always incomparably greater than that of the great men who desired to purchase the poets' praise.

In this, too, the emperors set the example. They of course expected and demanded from contemporary poets the glorification of their rule and achievements, of their person and family, of their buildings and other undertakings, of their festivals and shows, and, like Augustus, directly called for it. Certainly, during every reign there existed a poetical literature exclusively devoted to its glorification. Two years after Trajan's accession, we read of 'serious poems' (as contrasted with the effeminate panegyrics on Domitian), in which his praises were sung. Indeed, the glorification of the emperor was so generally regarded as the most natural task of poetry, that prominent (especially epic) poets, who as a rule chose other subjects, chiefly mythological, as least compromising, found it necessary to make excuses or explanations: that they were quite incapable, or not yet capable, of so lofty a task; that they would make the attempt when they were better equipped. In fact, Statius, who expresses himself to this effect at the commencement of both his *Thebais* and his *Achilleis*, had already written poems, presumably

short ones, on Domitian's German and Dacian wars. As early as the Augustan age, poets felt bound to provide such explanations. Virgil in his *Georgics* declares his intention, after he has finished it, of girding himself to sing of raging battles, and of proclaiming Caesar's fame to posterity. I would sing of the wars of Caesar, says Propertius, of Mutina, Philippi, the Perusian, Sicilian and Alexandrian wars, and the triumph at Actium, if I were capable of it. And three hundred years later, Nemesianus at the beginning of his *Cynegetica* (a didactic poem on hunting) promises that he will one day sing of the triumphs of the sons of Carus ' with a more competent lyre '. Again, Julian the Apostate in his panegyric on the emperor Constantius says that all who have anything to do with literature extol him in both verse and prose, and that it is especially easy for poets to praise his deeds.

But apart from the fame which they expected, the emperors as a rule evidently recognized a certain obligation to show their practical interest in poetry by the payment of grants and fees to prominent poets. They were regarded as the most natural and the highest patrons and protectors of poetry and poets, who accordingly addressed their dedications and homage to the emperors before all. In addition, it is worth notice, that while rhetoricians were often elevated to lucrative and influential offices, no single instance is known of a poet being so promoted. It is most probable that he was usually rewarded by considerable gifts of money.

Horace declares that every one looked forward confidently to a time when a mere hint to Augustus that any one was devoting himself to poetry would be enough to secure him a livelihood at once and encouragement to continue. Even without this assurance, we could form an idea of the pretensions and expectations aroused in the poetical world at that time by the decided interest shown by Augustus in the revival of poetry. An anecdote related by Macrobius shows the importunity and outspokenness of the poets who bombarded him with homage and dedications. A Greek had presented to him, for several days in succession, as he was leaving the palace, some trifling flatteries in verse ; but Augustus did not seem to pay any attention. When he saw that the Greek was going to repeat the attempt, Augustus himself

wrote down some verses, and ordered one of his suite to hand them to him. The Greek read them, and by his looks and gesture expressed the profoundest admiration; then, approaching the emperor's litter, he offered him a few *denarii*, at the same time regretting that his means did not allow him to give more. This happy thought brought him a present of 100,000 sesterces.

Horace praises Augustus for the keen and sound judgment shown by him in his gifts to poets; his princely donations to Virgil and Varius especially did him honour. Varius had received 1,000,000 sesterces for his *Thyestes*, which was performed at the spectacles in honour of the victory of Actium; Virgil was richly rewarded, especially for the sixth book of the *Aeneid*, which contained the glorification of the house of the Caesars. He is said to have left a fortune of 10,000,000 sesterces. Horace, whose chief desire was to live in modest retirement, had positively to refuse the offers of Augustus; more than any other man he might have looked for wealth and honour, had he not despised both; at his death, he made Augustus his heir.

There is reason to believe that the liberality of the later emperors was as a rule exploited on a large scale by the poets, since nearly all the poets of those times forced themselves upon the emperor's attention by dedications or occasional flattering addresses or notices; the panegyrics in verse, composed for festal and other occasions, of which there was an enormous number, even if not directly intended for presentation to the emperor, were written in view of such a contingency. The *Eclogues* of Calpurnius Siculus afford a specimen of the homage offered to the emperors by needy poets. This poet had certainly found a patron ('Meliboeus', perhaps Calpurnius Piso), himself a poet, who had protected him from want and saved him from the necessity of migrating from Rome to a province (Baetica). But still he is continually complaining of his poverty, which obliges him to think of earning a livelihood, and prevents him from producing as much good work as he otherwise might. Hence he begs Meliboeus to present his poems to the emperor and thus become his Maecenas; since he also has access to the 'holy apartments' of the emperor, 'the Phoebus of the Palatine' (Nero). In the poem this prince, who had just ascended

the throne, is praised by the god Faunus and celebrated in the amoebaeans of the herdsmen. The whole world, all peoples adore him, the Gods love him, with his reign another golden age has commenced, he is a god sent down from heaven in the form of man, and so forth. Another poem describes a magnificent spectacle, given by the 'youthful god' in the (wooden) amphitheatre (constructed in the year 57).

Many incidental but trustworthy statements prove that the emperors did not allow the poems dedicated to them to pass unrewarded. Tiberius handsomely rewarded the Knight Gaius Lutorius Priscus for a universally praised elegy on the death of Germanicus. When Tiberius's son Drusus fell ill in the year 21, the poet, in the hope of a second reward in case this prince died, composed another elegy, which he was foolish enough to read before a number of distinguished ladies; he was denounced and condemned to death by the senate for *lèse-majesté*. Claudius also must have been liberal to poets, since the 'modern poets' lamented his death. An epigram on a Greek poet living in Rome runs as follows: 'Had not the emperor Nero given me some ready money, it would have gone ill with me, O Muses, daughters of Zeus!' Vespasian was liberal in his support of eminent poets; the needy Saleius Bassus received a present of 500,000 sesterces. Juvenal greets the emperor Hadrian, who had just succeeded to the throne, as the only hope of the poets; he alone protects the sorrowing Muses, at a time when they can expect neither favour nor support from other quarters; he will not suffer a poet to be reduced to work for his bread in the future in a manner unworthy of him; may his grace and favour, which are on the look out for worthy objects, act as a spur to youthful talent! The Greek poet Oppian is said to have received a piece of gold from the emperor Marcus Aurelius for every line of his poems which he read in his presence.

Next to the emperors, who with the best intentions in the world could only satisfy a small part of the petitions and entreaties addressed to them, it was from the great men of Rome that poets expected and received protection and assistance. Of all these patrons of poetry there was none to compare with Maecenas. His importance as a diplomatist, statesman and co-founder of the new order of things was

eclipsed in the next generation by the glory of having been the noblest 'protector of those dedicated to Mercury' [in his capacity of patron god of learned men and poets]. The fact that Maecenas, at an advanced age, when, according to Tacitus, he retained the appearance of the imperial confidence rather than any real power, had more leisure after his retirement from public affairs to exhibit his literary sympathies, may have further contributed to this reputation, independently of the unanimous and enthusiastic praises of contemporary poets.

With admirable judgment he recognized genuine talent, sometimes before it revealed itself, no easy task at a time when poetical dilettantism was rampant, and one rendered still more difficult after it was recognized that poetical talent was a means of gaining the favour of this great man. The number of those who, with this end in view, assumed the title of poet with more or less justification, must have been large, since even the importunate vulgar thought it necessary to have recourse to this expedient, and men forced their way to him whose chief recommendation in their own eyes was the capacity of writing more verses, and more rapidly, than any one else. Maecenas chose his friends and associates without regard to birth, rank or external advantages, but at the same time he did not consider talent and education alone; he knew how to keep sordid and disturbing elements at a distance. No house in Rome, says Horace, was purer or more free from intrigue; every one had his place and no man tried to oust another. Hence it was not easy to gain admission. Horace, who after the battle of Philippi had no resources except his brains and was emboldened by poverty to write verses, was recommended to Maecenas by Virgil and Varius, those honest souls whose friendship he valued above all else. The first audience was brief; the poet, then about twenty-six years old, was so embarrassed that he could only stammer a few words about his affairs; Maecenas, as a rule, said very little. Horace thought himself already forgotten, when, nine months later, he was invited to an intimacy with Maecenas, which lasted uninterruptedly for more than thirty years, till the death of both almost at the same time. Maecenas gave the poet as much and more than he needed, a position free from anxiety and a little property

with garden, wood and fountain, his 'delightful retreat' in the Sabine mountains; and what he gave, he gave with the greatest delicacy. In his later years a chronic invalid, a martyr to insomnia, and subject to fits of despondency, Maecenas was inclined to exact too much from Horace, whose society he found almost indispensable. Nevertheless, the poet's tact and affection enabled him to decline frankly his friend's invitations, without rousing his anger. Maecenas, in his will, besought Augustus to 'remember Horatius Flaccus as myself!'

Evidently he was more intimate with Horace than with any other poet of the day; but all whom he gathered round him were fascinated not merely by his intellect and refined manners, and his lively and stimulating interest in their works, but almost as much by his consummate skill in associating on terms of equality with men of intellect. The great men of Italy in modern times have been equally distinguished in this respect above those of all other nations. Thus he was exceptionally fitted to be the centre of a circle formed by the highest intellectual aristocracy of his time. Many palaces may have been open to poets in later times, but none ever saw so brilliant an assembly again, none ever was so hospitable as the house of Maecenas, a lofty and imposing building on the heights of the Esquiline in the midst of a large park and gardens, with an extensive view of the bustling city, the Campagna and the mountains, Tibur, Aesula and Tusculum from its upper floors. Later, the mound that marked the grave of Maecenas and that of Horace beside it rose on the spot. After the death of Maecenas, garden and palace became the property of the emperor (Nero watched the burning of Rome from its windows in the year 64), and later of Fronto.

Later, the relation of poets to their distinguished protectors was as a rule that of client to patron. The reason of this was partly that, as the brilliancy of the golden age of Roman poetry gradually faded, the noble appreciation of poetic genius in the higher circles of society, which characterized it, also disappeared. But the poets themselves were also in great measure to blame, since with all their exaggerated self-estimation they lacked the confident feeling of their own value, the self-reliance of 'men 'who had seen the republic', such as distinguished the poor son of the freedman of Venusia

even in the presence of his powerful benefactor, the descendant of an Etruscan princely family. Even in Horace's time, mediocre and needy poets lacked this feeling; this is clearly shown by the anonymous panegyric on Messalla, a miserable patchwork of phrases, overloaded with mythological and other scholastic erudition in certain passages, in which the want of taste almost results in nonsense. And yet this production has been thought worthy of inclusion in the collection of poems which bears the name of Tibullus. The poet begs Messalla to take the will for the deed; he is well aware of the feebleness of his powers and of the defects of his poetry. He has formerly been well-to-do; now, reduced to poverty, he puts himself entirely at his patron's disposal; if Messalla will only take a little interest in him, he will prize the favour as much as the gold of Lydia or the reputation of Homer. Even if his verses only rarely fall from the lips of his honoured patron, destiny will never prevent him from singing his praises; nay, he is ready to do even more for him,—to brave the dangers of the sea, face a squadron of cavalry, or trust his body to the flames of Aetna.

About the middle of the first century, the most brilliant and distinguished of the great families of Rome was that of Piso, the head of the conspiracy against Nero, the object of which was to set him on the throne, but which in reality caused his death (in 65). His princely liberality appears to have been chiefly shown to poets. He himself was a poet, verses flowed readily from his pen, he played the *cithara* like a master, 'his house resounded throughout with the varied performances of its inmates'; devotion to art and science was the rule. The mediocre poem, with which a still youthful poet endeavoured to obtain an introduction to Piso, is a not uninteresting specimen of 'clients' poetry'. After celebrating the renown of Piso's family, he speaks of the admirable qualities of its present representative (especially his eloquence) and the honour of the consulship already bestowed upon him; praises his noble presence, his sincerity, his generosity and affability, his education, his musical and poetical talents, his skill in sword exercise, tennis and draughts—a description which essentially agrees with that given by Tacitus. At the conclusion the poet declares that all he asks is that Piso will deign to admit him into his house, for

he is not influenced by thirst for gold, but solely by the desire of fame. He will think himself happy if he may pass his life with Piso and attempt to describe his virtues in verses worthy of them ; if Piso will open to him the path of glory and rescue him from obscurity, he will do great things. Perhaps even Virgil would have remained unknown without a Maecenas to protect him ; and Maecenas, not content with opening his house to him alone, also laid the foundation of the fame of Varius and Horace. Under his protection, poets never had to fear starvation in their old age. If Piso will listen to his prayers, the poet will sing of him in polished verse as his Maecenas ; since he feels capable of handing down a name to posterity, if indeed one may promise anything of the kind. He feels that he has courage and strength to do something great, if only Piso will stretch out his hand to the swimmer, and draw him out of the retirement into which his humble birth and poverty have thrust him. His powers are greater than one might imagine from the number of his years, since the first down is only beginning to cover his cheeks and he has not yet passed his twentieth summer.

After Nero, the position of the aristocracy, and with it that of the poets dependent upon it, underwent a change for the worse. Many of the great families had ruined themselves by luxury and extravagance ; others had fallen victims to the suspicion, hatred or cupidity of the imperial despotism. The reign of Vespasian brought to Rome new men from the cities of Italy and the provinces, who retained their old habits, contracted under more restricted conditions of life, while the emperor himself set the example of economy ; under Domitian, distinguished men had to guard against arousing suspicion by too lavish a display of generosity or too numerous a *clientèle*. Thus, the poets of that time certainly had reason to wish for the return of the good old days of Maecenas, and even of Seneca and Piso. When Martial, then a young man, came to Rome about the year 63, the hall of the Pisos, filled with ancestral busts, and the houses of his countrymen the three Senecas (the philosopher, Junius Gallio, and Annaeus Mela the father of Lucan) were open to him. All perished in the years 65 and 66 ; and towards the end of the century the only surviving representative of the great Seneca family was Lucan's wife Polla Argentaria, Martial's patroness,

addressed by him as ' queen ' as late as 96. Under Domitian such patrons of literature as Piso, Seneca, Vibius Crispus and Memmius Regulus no longer existed ; at least, the two most prominent poets, Martial and Statius, strove to gain the favour of a large number of persons, without being able to obtain what had formerly been granted by a single individual.

Martial had certainly been connected with the court during the reign of Titus, who had bestowed upon him the privileges of a father of three children (*jus trium liberorum*), confirmed by Domitian, and perhaps raised him to the status of a knight by creating him titular tribune. His recommendation was enough to procure the citizenship for several claimants, and he was occasionally honoured with an invitation to the imperial table ; but the emperor refused, although not ungraciously, a request for a few thousand sesterces. As the poet never returns thanks for gifts received, he does not seem to have been indebted to him for any real improvement in his position, although he continually begged for it, ' without timidity or embarrassment ' ; he was not even permitted to connect his country or town house with the Marcian aqueduct. This is the more striking, as Domitian was fond of reading his poems ; had not this been the case, Martial would not have ventured to make frequent references to his approval. He is also unwearying in his efforts to win the favour of influential freedmen and other persons at court, sometimes by the most degrading flattery ; he praises them generally and flatters them individually—Parthenius, the chamberlain, Entellus master of petitions, Euphemus the superintendent of the table, Earinus the cup-bearer, Crispinus the imperial favourite, the father (already retired) of Etruscus, and a certain Sextus, who appears to have been the director of the imperial studies.

During a twenty years' stay in Rome, however, Martial had been brought into frequent relations with members of the aristocracy, which he sought to keep up and enlarge by honourable mention of them in his poems, which (as he himself says) bestowed upon them lasting fame, although he gained nothing himself by such homage. His long-standing connexion with Seneca obtained him the friendship of Quintus Ovidius, who had accompanied Caesonius (or Caesennius) Maximus, a friend of Seneca the philosopher, into exile in Sicily. The large number of men of senatorial rank to whom Martial offers homage

or flattery, whom he begs or thanks for favours in his epigrams (written during the last twelve years of his stay in Rome from 86 to 98, and in Spain up to 101 or 102) includes the following names : the poet Silius Italicus (consul 68) and his sons ; Nerva, afterwards emperor ; the wealthy orator Marcus Aquilius Regulus, notorious as an accuser in cases of *lèse-majesté* ; the enormously rich brothers Domitius Tullus and Domitius Lucanus ; the poet Stertinius Avitus (consul 92, who in 94 had the portrait of Martial set up in his library) ; the well-known author Sextus Julius Frontinus (consul for the second time 98, for the third time 100) ; the younger Pliny (consul 100) ; the poet Arruntius Stella (consul 101) ; Lucius Norbanus Appius Maximus, conqueror of Lucius Antonius Saturninus (twice consul) ; Licinius Sura (consul 102), Trajan's most powerful friend ; Marcus Antonius Primus of Tolosa, Vespasian's former partisan ; and many others. Naturally, Martial sought and found patrons amongst the knights. Amongst them may have been the elegant Atedius Melior, who gave such excellent dinners in his beautiful house and garden on the Mons Caelius. One of the friends whose praises he most frequently sings is a centurion, Aulus Pudens, who appears to have reached the rank of *primipilaris*, but not the summit of his ambition, admission to the equestrian order. He also enjoyed and highly appreciated the friendship of other centurions, to judge from his honourable mention of them in his poems.

Statius to some extent moved in the same circles as Martial and also endeavoured to win the favour of the same patrons, above all of the emperor ; he never published anything ' without appealing to his divinity '. Yet his repeated and obsequious homage and laughably exaggerated flatteries seem to have gained him nothing from Domitian but an invitation to table and a supply of water from a public aqueduct for his house near Alba. Like Martial, Statius flattered the imperial freedmen ; besides Etruscus and his father and the youthful eunuch Earinus, he especially sang the praises of the imperial Secretary Abascantus. Some of Martial's patrons (Lucius Arruntius Stella, Polla Argentaria the wife of Lucan and Atedius Melior) were also Statius's. Many senators, whose names are found in his poems, attended his frequent readings ; the aged consular and city praefect, Rutilius Gallicus,

the young Vettius Crispinus and Maecius Celer. He also enjoyed the friendship of members of the equestrian order (such as Septimius Severus, great grandfather of the emperor of that name) and of wealthy friends of literature, whom he had known in his native city Naples.

Nevertheless, in spite of their relations, so eagerly sought and carefully cultivated, with so many great and wealthy men, and in spite of the general approval with which they were received in these circles, both poets remained poor. We know this of Statius from a passage of Juvenal already referred to ; he was not so undignified as to be always complaining and begging in his poems, like Martial. He certainly had a small estate near Alba, probably the gift of one of his patrons, but it was a poor one and reared no cattle ; his failure in the Capitoline *agon* can hardly have been the only reason which induced him to return home and end his days in his native city, when at the height of his fame as a poet. Martial also possessed a small vineyard near Nomentum, but it was barren and poorly wooded, and produced nothing except an inferior wine and 'apples like lead'. But it must be admitted that Martial was anything but an agriculturist. If his friend Stella had not sent him some tiles to repair the roof of his house, the rain would have come in; the chief advantage of his property was that he could retire thither from the worries of clientship and take a rest. Towards the end of his stay at Rome some one had given him a team of mules, and he also had a small town house on the Quirinal, where he had formerly had a lodging on the third storey. But he was never independent or free from anxiety, until, at the age of fifty-seven, he decided to leave Rome, whose atmosphere was life to him, and to end his days in his native Spain. There, the cheap living and the liberality of native patrons (especially Terentius Priscus and Marcella), made it possible for him to idle and enjoy himself to his heart's content.

While poets were thus dependent on a single patron, only the most lofty conception of the bond of union could entirely exclude the danger of the degradation of the former—a danger which increased as their position became more precarious and irksome. The example of Martial shows that, in the case of less noble natures, the position of a client almost necessarily led to the misuse of poetical talent and personal degradation.

Martial not only reminds his readers in general and his patrons in particular, that a poet wants money above all things; he is continually begging, even for a *toga*, a cloak and the like. He writes on one occasion to Regulus, that he is so pressed for money that he will be obliged to sell his presents; will Regulus buy something? He even declares with cynical frankness, that his poetical gifts are at the disposal of any one who likes to pay for them: 'A man whom I have praised in one of my poems, pretends he owes me nothing; he has taken me in'. In one of his epigrams the emperor is supposed to ask, what he has gained from conferring immortality on so many in his poems? his answer is: nothing, but it amuses me. Probably all were not of the same opinion as the younger Pliny, who thought it his duty to pay Martial's travelling expenses in return for a poem of praise, since no gifts could be greater than those bestowed by the poet, 'fame, praise and immortality'. Yet many of those who were praised by Martial certainly paid for the honour, although not always as liberally as he expected.

But he mainly turned his talents to account in intellectual and witty conversation in social circles, for which indeed they were best adapted; and on such occasions he degraded them as much as by his most cringing flatteries. We certainly cannot blame him for writing poems to order or on given subjects, such as the *Xenia*, which to all appearance were originally written as labels for *Saturnalia* presents in wealthy houses. But since the jovial guests at the *Saturnalia* carousals and readers generally relished nothing so much as indecency, Martial in this respect also accommodated himself to the taste of the public. The ideas of decency at that time allowed the poet any obscenities, if disguised in elegant language; the disproportionately large number of indecent epigrams shows how ready Martial was to satisfy the grossest tastes of the majority, and the manner of his excuses makes it clear that he himself was conscious of having overstepped the bounds of propriety.

In spite of his brilliant talents, Martial with his merry *Saturnalia* poems reminds us somewhat of the strolling poets of old times, who invited themselves to banquets, where they were welcome, but were treated somewhat contemptuously. Statius was saved from a similar humiliation by the nature of his talents, which always had in view the pathetic and solemn;

also he had more sense of his own dignity than Martial and a higher idea of poetry. His minor poems give us an idea of the origin of the higher occasional poetry of the age and its usual subjects. Of the three chief classes of such poems—on births, marriages and deaths—Statius's forte was the last; the four 'consolatory poems' of his collection are selected from a large number. He calls himself 'the gentle consoler of the afflicted, who has so often soothed the pain of the still bleeding wounds of fathers and mothers, comforted affectionate sons at their father's grave, dried so many tears and so often made his voice heard beside the tomb by departing spirits.' This clearly shows that he had produced many such poems. Rich people also commissioned poets to write them for the funerals of favourite slaves and freedmen, and even of animals; Statius has included two, one on the death of Atedius Melior's green talking parrot, the other on that of a lion torn to pieces in the arena by another wild animal. As a rule, every joyful or melancholy event in distinguished families was celebrated by the house and client poets. The poems of Statius on the recovery of Rutilius Gallicus from a severe illness, on Domitian's seventeenth consulship, on Maecius Celer's journey to his garrison in Syria are examples of the numerous and varied subjects of occasional poems. But the services of poets were especially requisitioned at the celebration of festivals, the inauguration of important buildings or artistic undertakings. The day after the colossal equestrian statue of Domitian was set up in the Forum, Statius was ordered to let the emperor have a poem upon it.

At these solemnities, occasional poetry supplied the place of modern journalism. Rich people gladly availed themselves of it, to secure publicity for eulogistic descriptions of their beautiful villas and gardens, baths, splendid buildings, art collections and valuables, and probably there was never any lack of poets ready to meet their wishes. 'You praise the baths of Ponticus, who gives such good dinners, in three hundred verses', says Martial; 'you don't really want to bathe, but to dine'. But even when there was no special reason for it, the majority were anxious that famous poets should sing their praises, and frequently directly invited them to do so.

The larger and more distinguished the family, the more numerous probably were the poets who were eager to bestow

poetical consecration on all the most important incidents in the life of its members, whether joyful or melancholy. In her passionate grief for her son Marcellus Octavia refused to listen to ' the poems composed to glorify his memory '. At a marriage festival in the house of the emperor Gallienus all the Greek and Latin poets recited nuptial songs for many days together ; but the emperor with a few verses carried off the prize ' from a hundred poets '. Of course the number 100 is not here to be taken literally ; but in modern times, less than eight days after the birth of the King of Rome, more than 2,000 odes, hymns and other poetical expressions of homage reached the Tuileries, for which Napoleon paid 100,000 francs by way of honoraria. Although poets, of course, participated most frequently in the glorification of festivals in the imperial palace, they appear to have done the same in aristocratic houses generally, where in accordance with Roman taste people amused themselves by listening to the numerous productions offered to them. On the occasion of the wedding of Stella and Violentilla, Statius summons the whole ' troop ' of poets, especially the elegiac poets, the singers of love, ' to contend in various modes ', each according to his mastery of the lyre. Of the certainly considerable number of poems, in which the contemporary poets of Rome, in response to this appeal, sang of the wedding of their distinguished colleague, only those of Statius and Martial have been preserved.

But as in this case, so on other and quite different occasions the two poets wrote pieces on the same themes for the same patrons and friends. Both lamented the death of Atedius Melior's favourite freedman and of the aged father of Claudius Etruscus ; both celebrated the sumptuous bath constructed by the latter and the bronze statuette by Lysippus, belonging to Novius Vindex ; both presented Lucan's widow with some poems on the celebration of her birthday ; and when the eunuch Flavius Earinus, Domitian's cup-bearer, cut off his hair and sent it in a box set with precious stones together with his mirror to the temple of Aesculapius at Pergamus, Statius at his desire composed a lengthy poem on the event and Martial five short ones. Now, since we find the only two poets of the time, with whose occasional pieces we are acquainted, so often and deliberately dealing with the same subjects, we may fairly assume that on extraordinary occasions also as a

rule a crowd of poets was seized with inspiration, and that there was a perfect downpour of poems, long and short, in all kinds of metres.

Athough Statius and Martial so frequently visited the same houses, that each must have often been witness of the other's success, neither of them mentions the other, while both are lavish in praise of their numerous poetical colleagues. Evidently they did not love one another, as indeed was hardly to be expected, considering the profound contrast of their natures; even if the Spanish poet, now growing old, had been able to refrain from vexation and jealousy at the fame of the Neapolitan, which threatened to eclipse his own. But he frequently expressed a contemptuous opinion of long mythological epopees, although he does not mention the *Thebaid* of Statius. 'Certainly', he says, 'every one praises and admires them, but my epigrams are read. Epics contain nothing but monstrous abortions of the imagination; whereas my epigrams touch real life to the quick, and must be read by any one who wishes to understand himself or the age in which he lives. Any one who regards epigrams as mere trifles, mistakes their character; in reality the poet who deals with fables and legends is the trifler. The figures of epopees are giants, but of clay; my figures are small, but they live. My little books are free from fustian and bombast, my Muse never struts in a ridiculous, swelling dress with a long train. Let those austere and overserious people, who burn the midnight oil, handle the highly tragic and lofty themes of Greek mythology; I will season genuine Roman poems with wit, and be content with the modest shepherd's flute, since its tones surpass the trumpet blasts of so many others.' In face of these attacks, made in the years in which he read the last books of his *Thebais* and the first of his *Achilleis* to the loud applause of a large audience, Statius never condescended to criticize epigrams unfavourably. He characterizes his own short poems, written 'as a sort of epigrams', as insignificant trifles, thrown off on the spur of the moment; he had been blamed for publishing anything of the kind, but he was of opinion that even badinage might be justified. At the conclusion of his *Thebaid* he complains of the clouds of mist, heaped up by envy to obscure its brilliancy.

At all times envy and jealousy amongst poets arise from their easily wounded vanity, their exaggerated self-esteem

and thirst for glory; but in the period with which we are concerned, their dependent position, their rival efforts to win the favour and approval of the great, on whom their very existence depended, were only too likely to arouse the ugly passions of ignoble natures, and often led to irritation, persecution and calumny, intrigue and cabal of all kinds. Martial suffered much from enemies, envious and unfavourable critics of various kinds. The criticism of the literary circles of Rome was as a rule anything but benevolent. Many (from envious motives, says Martial) blamed the indecency of his epigrams; but the number of those who declined to recognize living poets and praised only those of the past, was probably larger, as is always the case. In general, Martial regarded the censure of poets as rather a proof of the universally good reception accorded to his works, and justly preferred to see his poems approved by the guests than by the cooks. One of those who 'were ready to burst with envy' because all Rome read his poems, because he was pointed out in the streets, because many welcomed him as a guest, because he had secured a modest competence, was a Jewish poet, who was always criticizing his poems, but all the same plundered them. However, it did not trouble Martial much if plagiarists gave out and read his verses as their own, since the difference between their productions was so great that no one could help noticing the theft. He frequently complains, however, of what was far more prejudicial to his reputation as a poet and his position generally; anonymous poets, whose identity could not be traced, published broadcast under his name virulent abuse and vulgar insults directed against men and women of rank. This treachery was all the more likely to injure him with his patrons, since in any case there was always the danger that persons, whose favour was of great importance to him, might think his sarcasm was intended for themselves; hence his repeated assertion that he never has any particular individual in view.

In addition to these and similar glimpses in Martial's poems of the doings at these meetings in the 'school of the poets' or the portico of the temple of Quirinus, they furnish other information concerning the literary interests and tendencies of the time.

In particular, the epigrams of Martial, the poems of Statius

(90–96) and the letters of the younger Pliny (97–108/9), which are directly connected with both, acquaint us with the relation of educated society to poetry in the time of Domitian, Nerva, and the beginning of Trajan's reign. Yet the phenomena disclosed, though characteristic of this relation and of literature in general, are not exactly confined to this period alone, but may be considered essentially applicable to the whole time from Augustus to Hadrian. They also confirm the observation, that poetry at that time was of greater importance and exercised a greater influence upon education in general than at the present day.

The first impression is that of excessive industry and productivity throughout the domain of poetical literature, the whole field of which was cultivated by rival poets and *dilettanti*. Thus Juvenal, in a despairing outburst against perpetual recitations, mentions poems of the most varied kinds, which one was compelled to listen to daily; one reads a *Theseis*, another Roman comedies, a third elegies; a *Telephus* [1], and a never-ending *Orestes* take up a whole day; the columns and plane-trees of a peristyle used by the reciters resound unceasingly with descriptions of the combats of the Centaurs, of the judgment of the dead, of the carrying off of the golden fleece. A certain Varro according to Martial was equally distinguished as a writer of tragedies and mimes, lyrics and elegies; Canius Rufus of Gades appears to have been no less versatile. Manilius Vopiscus wrote lyric and epic poems, satires and epistles; Pollius Felix hexameters, epodes or distichs and iambics. In addition to the best known kinds of poetry, others less common are mentioned, such as the Aristophanic comedy and the mimiambus; many composed in Greek. Of course Martial, Statius and Pliny only tell us the names of a few contemporary poets; according to Quintilian, the number of satirists and lyric poets was considerable.

But epos, especially mythological, was probably the favourite; long epic poems of the period have been preserved, all of which, with the exception of the *Punica* of Silius Italicus, are mythological—the *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus, the *Thebais* and *Achilleis* of Statius. Juvenal's remarks on recitations also indicate a preponderance of epos. Its subjects were the most harmless; the poet who set Aeneas and

[1] Telephus, King of Mysia, a favourite subject of tragedy.

Turnus fighting might feel certain of never giving offence; nobody could complain of a wounded Achilles or a drowning Hylas. To this was added the authority of Virgil, whose form was thought the easiest to reproduce. Accordingly, the school of necessity directed its poetical efforts to the field of Greek legend. Its wealth of poetic material facilitated execution; in addition to Virgil numerous (and especially Alexandrine) models, ready to hand, supplied the want of invention, and of power to create new poems. Again, epos offered the widest scope for the development of all the excellences, which even a less gifted *dilettante* might appropriate, such as beauty of language, irreproachable versification, rhetorical pathos, and above all, descriptive liveliness. Horace speaks of descriptions of nature, which could be used as 'purple patches' to conceal the nakedness of long poems: 'a grove and altar of Diana, a stream winding through smiling fields, the course of the Rhine, the rainbow'. Seneca mentions Aetna, sunrise and sunset among such poetical commonplaces. Juvenal declares that every one knows the cave of Vulcan and the grove of Mars better than his own house. The author of *Aetna* declares that he intends to strike out a new path; the old legends are too hackneyed. Every one knows the golden age better than his own world. Who has not sung of the expedition of the Argonauts, the Trojan war, the misfortunes of Niobe and of the house of Atreus, the adventures of Cadmus, the desertion of Ariadne? Similarly, at the end of the third century, Nemesianus in the introduction to his *Cynegetica* announces his intention of abandoning the 'beaten track'. He enumerates a number of mythological subjects, adding, 'a number of great poets have already anticipated all these; the old legends of former times are known to all'. Further, we may assume that Virgil's *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, as well as his *Aeneid*, were frequently imitated. Columella chose horticulture as the subject of a poem, simply because 'the divine Maro, the poet deserving of the highest reverence', had expressly called upon his successors to treat this department of agriculture poetically. Martial's friend, Julius Cerealis, besides a *Gigantomachia*, composed some rural poems, 'inferior only to those of the immortal Virgil'. The *Georgica* composed by Clodius Albinus, the rival of the emperor Severus, was also a poem.

But most of the educated men, who did not make poetry their profession but, like Atticus, were unwilling to deprive themselves of the charm which it lent to life, and whose poetical efforts were only a recreation, distraction or literary exercise, as a rule had no time for long-winded epics. The younger Pliny recommends a friend, who was training for an orator, sometimes to write something historical or a letter. 'You will do quite right again in refreshing yourself with poetry; when I say so, I do not mean that species of poetry which turns upon subjects of great length and continuity (such being suitable only for persons of leisure), but those little pieces of the sprightly kind of poesy, which serve as proper reliefs to, and are consistent with, employments of every sort. They commonly go under the name of poetical amusements; but these amusements have sometimes gained their authors as much reputation as works of a more serious nature. In this manner the greatest men, as well as the greatest orators, used either to exercise or amuse themselves, or rather, indeed, did both. It is surprising how much the mind is enlivened and refreshed by these little poetical compositions, as they turn upon love, hatred, satire, tenderness, politeness, and everything in short that concerns life and the affairs of the world. Besides, the same advantage attends these, as every other sort of poems, that we turn from them to prose with so much the more pleasure after having experienced the difficulty of being constrained and fettered by metre' (Melmoth's translation).

Apart from these poetical exercises, amateur and even professional poetry no doubt consisted to a great extent, if not mainly, of reproductions of classical Greek or Roman models, and in the former case was often merely a free translation. And such reproduction was by no means unintentional. While at the present day even poetical amateurs strive after the appearance of originality in inverse proportion to their real capacity, the later Roman poets made no such effort, since their greatest predecessors from time immemorial had made it their object to transplant the flower of Greek poetry to Roman soil. Throughout the entire domain of ancient art respect for tradition was so strong that forms once recognized as models had the binding force of laws, which no artist dared resist or alter at discretion. Imitation, copy and repro-

duction were held to be legitimate and allowable, and to a certain extent industry and study were considered an adequate substitute for originality. This is especially true of all post-Augustan poetry, the chief characteristic of which is the unexampled frequency of imitations and repetitions, echoes and reminiscences of every kind. There were even 'Ovidian' and 'Virgilian' poets, who apparently employed only Ovidian and Virgilian turns, phrases and verses.

The enormous influence of Virgil on later poetry, especially epos, has been already mentioned. As Ennius and Virgil had imitated Homer, so later epic poets wrote under the spell which Virgil exercised over the whole period. Silius Italicus reverenced his picture more than that of any other great man, celebrated his birthday more conscientiously than his own, and approached his tomb as if it had been a temple. Statius, who at the end of his *Thebais* craves for its immortality, adds that he is content to follow the divine *Aeneis* at a distance and to tread in its footsteps with holy awe. In other branches, also, poets obtained the highest praise for the successful imitation of a great model. Passennus Paullus, a friend of the younger Pliny, was a zealous imitator of the ancients generally, whose poems he copied and reproduced, especially those of Propertius, to whose family he belonged, and whose most successful imitator he was; his elegies were 'written entirely in the house of Propertius'. Later, he turned his attention to lyric poetry, and reproduced Horace with the same fidelity.

For most of those who satisfied their aspirations by composing trifles, epigrams and all kinds of poetical odds and ends, Catullus, as in the Augustan age, was the model most generally followed; even the epigrams of a poet like Martial, certainly one of the most original of later writers, are full of reminiscences of him. He sends his little poems to Silius, as the gentle Catullus may have ventured to send his lament on the death of the sparrow to the great Virgil. This poem was the inevitable model for all similar subjects and appears to have been imitated times without number. Martial flatters Stella by saying that in his *Columba* (dove) he has shown himself as far superior to Catullus as a dove is larger than a sparrow. Unicus the Spaniard, a relative of Martial, wrote love poems, such as those of Catullus to

Lesbia or of Ovid to Corinna. Pliny's friend, Pompeius Saturninus, a distinguished orator and historian, also wrote verses ' like Catullus or Calvus, full of grace, sweetness, bitterness and passion ; their tenderness and playfulness was tempered with a certain severity, this too in the manner of Catullus or Calvus '. It would be in the highest degree unjust, adds Pliny, to admire him less because he is still alive. Pliny also listened with the greatest pleasure and even admiration to another friend, Sentius Augurinus, who had recited his little poems for three days running. ' There was a good deal of writing in the light and graceful, the lofty, the gay, the tender, the sweet and the satirical vein. I am of opinion there has not for these many years appeared anything more finished of the kind, if indeed my great affection for him and the praises he bestows upon me do not bias my judgment '. For he had said ' I sing in modest verses, as formerly Catullus, Calvus, and the poets of old. But what need to mention them ? Pliny, who also writes verslets, is more to me than all his predecessors '.

The example of Pliny, who did not begin ' to walk in the paths of Catullus ' until he had attained consular rank and was more than forty years of age, and who relates in great detail the history of the origin of this ' late spring of song ', shows most clearly how at that time the keen interest in literature necessarily attracted even the most matter-of-fact and unpoetical natures to poetry. He had already made several attempts at verse, as was only natural at a time when culture was so saturated with poetical elements, and since he himself had always aspired to literary distinction. He writes as follows to a friend : ' You have read, you say, my hendecasyllables, and are desirous to know what first induced a man of my gravity (as you are pleased to call me, though in truth I am only not a trifler) to write verses. To go back, then, to my earliest years, I had always an inclination to poetry, insomuch that when I was fourteen years of age, I composed a tragedy in Greek. What sort of a one do you ask ? I really don't know ; all I remember of it is that it was called a tragedy. Some time after this, on my return from the army, being detained in the island of Icaria by contrary winds, I wrote some Latin elegies on the self-same island and sea. I have since made some attempts in the heroic kind ;

but these are the first hendecasyllabics I have ever composed ; and the following incident gave them birth. The treatise of Asinius Gallus was read to me one day at Laurentum, in which he draws a comparison between his father and Cicero, and cites an epigram of Tully's on his own favourite Tiro. Upon retiring to take my afternoon's nap (for it was summer time) and not being able to sleep, I began to reflect that the greatest orators have been fond of poetry and by no means despised it as an art. I tried therefore what I could do in this way ; and though I had long disused myself to do things of this sort, I wrote down, in a much shorter time than I could have imagined, the following lines upon the subject which gave me the first hint' (Melmoth). The hexameters, in which he explains how Cicero's example determined him to abandon all restraint, are utterly prosaic and heavy, his hendecasyllables probably afforded an even more terrible example of the result 'when a pedant itches to attempt the free and easy'. 'From this I turned to elegy', he continues, 'which I executed with the same ease ; and being thus lured on by the facility with which the Muses yielded to me, I added others to the number of my productions of this kind. On my return to Rome I showed my performances to some of my friends, who were pleased to approve of them. Afterwards, whenever I had spare time, and particularly when I travelled, I made several other attempts in the poetical line. At length I determined, after the example of many others, to publish a separate volume of these poems, and I have no reason to repent of my resolution. They are much inquired after, and are in everybody's hands ; they have even tempted the Greeks to learn our language, who sing them to their harps and lyres. But why am I boasting so ? though poets, remember, possess the privilege of raving. Still, I am not giving you my own judgment, but that of others, which, be it right or wrong, I am exceedingly pleased with ; and have only to wish that posterity too may be of the same right or wrong way of thinking' (Melmoth). Later, Pliny published, or at least prepared for publication, a collection of smaller poems in various metres. At the request of his hearers, the recital lasted two days, for Pliny did not, 'like others, omit a portion and take credit for doing so ; he read everything, since he wanted to improve every-

thing ; and how was he to do this, if he only submitted select passages to the criticism of his friends ? ' This shows how the *dilettanti* of the time, incited to poetical efforts by the want of an intellectual occupation for their hours of leisure, the spirit of imitation, extensive reading, knack of verse-writing, the example of others, and the desire to be perfect in everything, soon came to fancy themselves poets, when they were as vain, as well-born and as rich as Pliny.

At that time it was evidently nothing exceptional for men of rank or position, whose time was much occupied, to devote their leisure hours to poetry even at an advanced age. In reference to the brilliant success of Calpurnius Piso's elegiac poems on the constellations, Pliny observes that it gives him all the more pleasure to record it, since, creditable as it was to any young man, it was a rare achievement for one of noble birth ; a remark which shows that comparatively few of the crowd of poets, who recited daily for months together, belonged to distinguished families, and in particular that the *dilettanti* of the upper classes can have had little time or inclination for considerable poetical undertakings. Amongst the consulars of that time, in addition to Pliny and Silius Italicus, Stertinius Avitus, Arruntius Stella and the aged Arrius Antoninus were poetical *dilettanti ;* Rutilius Gallicus also, praefect of the city (died 91–92) was a poet. Vestricius Spurinna, who had filled the highest offices (the consulship two or three times) and had been honoured (probably by Nerva) with a statue in triumphal dress, when 77 years of age, devoted some time daily between his walk and his bath to the composition of lyric poems in Greek and Latin, which according to Pliny were excellent. The knight Titinius Capito, who filled the extremely onerous post of imperial secretary under Domitian, Nerva, and Trajan, was also one of the chief supporters of literature, the patron of poets and literary men ; he attended the recitations of others, recited himself, and wrote remarkable poems on great men. The freedman Parthenius, Domitian's head chamberlain, whose influence was still considerable under Nerva, was according to Martial a favourite of Apollo and the Muses ; ' who drank more freely from their spring than he ? ' Unfortunately, he had not sufficient leisure for poetry. From the examples of Pollius Felix of Puteoli, Pomponius Bassulus of Aeclanum, Caninius Rufus of Comum, we may assume that

poetical dilettantism was general amongst the higher classes in the towns of Italy. At that time it was not merely one of the symptoms of the intellectual purification of immature youth, or of morbid development; poetry continued to be the life-long companion of a large number of educated men. It was practised not merely to ennoble and adorn the intellectual life, but also since it was prized as an essential element of culture; hence skill in managing poetical form was also regarded as a proof of superior education. Since even men of the class represented by Petronius's Trimalchio thought it incumbent on them to produce poems of their own, so as to appear well brought up, we can all the more easily understand how it was that clever poets, who preferred money to fame, sometimes found purchasers for their verses.

At the beginning of the second century, poetry was so important a factor in education that even prosaic natures like Pliny's could not escape its influence; the reign of Hadrian saw a great and sudden change, whereby prose regained its former ascendancy to such an extent that poetry gradually ceased to be the chief field of the literary efforts of *dilettanti* and artists, and even men of poetical gifts like Apuleius devoted themselves by preference to prose. The chief cause of this change, as already observed, was the new Greek 'sophistic'.

This new art of Greek elocution, whose professors were called by the old name of sophists, began to develop after the end of the first century. The importance which it acquired, the large number of able men whom it attracted, and the general, passionate and almost incredible admiration which it called forth in the Greek world, prove that it did not merely correspond completely to the taste of the age, but also filled a keenly felt want in intellectual life in a manner that satisfied the majority of educated men. The insatiable craving for some new intellectual amusement and an impressionability to art, survived with undiminished vigour in the declining nation; but the sound and unadulterated taste for real art, which during the centuries of the intellectual prime of Greece was formed in all departments by the marvellous abundance of magnificent creations, no longer existed.

The art of the sophists, so completely in harmony with the degenerate taste of later centuries, and apparently in all essen-

tials a revival of the Asiatic mannerism, was a spurious art. It created forms difficult to manage, hard and fast and trifling rules, even to the least details, for ' every kind of style, every form of thought, construction and rhythm ' ; great importance was also attached to correctness of expression, which it was sought to obtain by study and frequently perverse and pedantic imitation of ancient models, especially Attic. The chief excellence of the sophists, like that of the Meistersingers, consisted to a great extent in the apparent ease with which they surmounted the technical difficulties of their art : ' when Polemo turned a period, he uttered the last member of it with a smile, to show how easy he found it '. The knowledge of the technical rules of the new art of prose, gradually spreading amongst the educated public, sharpened the understanding and increased the admiration of the audience. But the object of special admiration was the art of improvisation, which, however, was not acquired by all the sophists ; one of the greatest of them, Herodes Atticus, is said to have prized it more highly than his consular rank and his descent from a consular family. In addition to this there was a studied declamation, which only too often, like the orator's attitude, facial play and gesture, verged upon the theatrical, or closely resembled a musical performance.

But all this, even combined with the still insatiable impressionability of the Greek ear to the charm of oratorical art, is perhaps insufficient to explain the astonishing success of these ' show speeches ', whose pretentious artificiality of form always repels us by the absence of real meaning, while their mawkish affectation, stilted unnaturalness, turgidity and bombast only result in a disagreeable caricature of the magnificent old-fashioned eloquence, which they claim to revive and reproduce. The enthusiasm for the sophists and their works, which showed itself in demonstrations of honour of every kind ; the crowding of studious young men to the cities, where they settled down as teachers ; the esteem in which they were held, which justified their playing the part of censors, advisers and peacemakers ; their own almost frenzied idea of the importance and effect of their activity—all would have been impossible, at least to such an extent, had not sophistic offered the national vanity of the Greeks a new satisfaction which they had long been without. The Greeks ' still tried to fancy themselves the great

nation ', and were confirmed in their pride at having been the teachers of the Romans by the latter themselves ; Greece had now produced a new and brilliant form of culture, and once again set the fashion in the department of literature. But what especially won for sophistic the passionate sympathy of the Greek world, was the fact that its chief task was the glorification of the great past of Greece ; the decaying nation knew no greater joy than to see itself mirrored in these reminiscences. The favourite subjects for improvisation with both sophists and their hearers were taken from Greek history. ' The deeds of their forefathers were handed down by history, and could be celebrated. But their speeches on numerous occasions were not so handed down. Consequently, it was possible to suggest what they might have said, and the answers that might have been made ; what they would have said, on occasions when they did not speak at all, if they had spoken. Some of these themes were, e.g., Demosthenes after the battle of Chaeronea ; how did Demosthenes defend himself against the accusation of Demades, that he had been bribed by the Persian King with fifty talents ? a speech to the Greeks after the end of the Peloponnesian war, declaring that all trophies must be destroyed, since it was really a civil war ; a consultation of the Lacedaemonians, to decide whether the Spartiatae who returned home from Sphacteria without their arms should be allowed to enter the country again ; whether Sparta, which was intended by the constitution of Lycurgus to be without walls, should be protected by a wall on the approach of the Persians. . . .' Most of these and similar themes were general favourites, and produced keen competition amongst the sophists. But none of them were so highly thought of as the so-called Median or Attic themes. In the former Darius and Xerxes were introduced, uttering their barbarian boasts against the Greeks ; in the latter the deeds and heroes of Marathon and Salamis were celebrated. This is wittily set forth by Lucian, in the ironical advice given by him to a rhetorician. ' Above all do not forget to speak of Marathon and Cynaegirus [1], for this is indispensable ; of the navigation of mount Athos and the crossing of the Hellespont ; of the sun darkened by the arrows of the Persians ; of Xerxes in flight ; let Leonidas

[1] Brother of Aeschylus, distinguished for his valour at the battle of Marathon.

be always praised, the words of Othryades [1] always read and the names of Salamis, Artemisium and Plataea repeated.' In the speech at the funeral of Proaeresius, a famous sophist of the fourth century, it was said, ' O Marathon and Salamis ! what a trumpet for your trophies and victories you have lost ! '

This new rhetoric strove to obtain sole authority in the domain of the arts of speech. It aimed at supplanting poetry or rather at bringing it within its own province. The mixture of the prosaic and poetical style of speech and expression, the poetical prose, which we discern in nearly all the productions of sophistic at that time and later, appears to have its root in this tendency. But the rhetoricians also believed they could take possession of the subjects of poetry. Festal speeches on gods and heroes, which were called simply ' hymns ', and panegyrics on celebrated and influential men of the past and present were regarded as substitutes for the lyrics of the grand style of the past. In the class of ' Descriptions ' also the poets were followed. This attempt to create a special rhetorical poetry also brought forth from the soil of the new sophistic its most characteristic production—the Greek love story.

Although this art owed its importance in the Greek world to its essentially national character, it also exercised great influence upon the Roman world. This was due to the traditional respect of the Romans for the authority of the Greeks throughout the domain of intellectual (in particular, literary) life, to their dependence upon the judgment of the Greeks, and to their desire, perhaps at that time more eager than ever before, to appropriate the advantages of Greek education. Just as they had always gone to school amongst the Greeks, ever since they had begun to elevate oratory to the dignity of an art, so at that time they earnestly endeavoured to profit by the latest and most perfect method adopted by the Greeks in the art of representation. Many young men journeyed from Italy and the countries of the west to Athens and other Greek centres of instruction, to obtain the latest educational polish by attending the lectures of the most celebrated teachers.

[1] The only Spartan survivor of the 300 who fought with the same number of Argives for the possession of the border-town Thyrea. He is said to have erected a trophy on the field and written a superscription with his blood.

The latter also made professional tours to Rome and other large towns in the west, where they sometimes made their home for a while. The chair of Greek oratory at Rome was one of the most coveted distinctions.

The importance and reputation of these Greek professors was enhanced by the notice taken of them by the emperors, who loaded them with distinctions and presents; were eager to secure their services as tutors of the heirs presumptive; promoted them to high offices (especially the Greek department of the imperial secretariate); and submitted with politeness, indulgence and patience to their ridiculous and even insolent pretentiousness. On the other hand, also, the entire attitude of the emperors towards the sophists justifies us in assuming that their works were highly and widely respected in the educated circles of Rome, and that the emperors shared this opinion.

Hadrian, the greatest admirer of the Greeks and the most ardent literary *dilettante*, was also a particular friend of the sophists; he is praised by the biographer Philostratus as the best fitted by nature of all the earlier emperors to understand and encourage distinguished talent. Trajan had bestowed upon the celebrated Polemo immunity from dues and taxes during all his journeys by land and sea; Hadrian extended the privilege to his descendants, elected him to the Academy (Museum) of Alexandria,[1] and voluntarily paid a debt of 250,000 *denarii* for him, if we may believe Philostratus, many of whose statements, however, are obviously insipid inventions or ridiculous exaggerations. But it is clear, from the childish way in which the sophists exaggerated their importance and their relation to the emperors, that such stories were generally credited. It is related that Polemo on one occasion rudely ejected Antoninus Pius, Hadrian's successor, and at that time proconsul of Asia, from his house at Smyrna. Hadrian, to protect Polemo against Antoninus's possible vengeance, expressly declared in his will that it was by Polemo's advice that he had adopted Antoninus, who accordingly, on his accession to the throne, bestowed all kinds of honours upon Polemo.

The biographies of Philostratus are full of such stories. While Marcus Aurelius was staying at Smyrna, the sophist

[1] Where learned men were supported at the expense of the State.

Aristides waited for the emperor to summon him, before paying his respects, and made the excuse that he did not wish to interrupt his studies. When Smyrna was subsequently destroyed by an earthquake, Aristides' *Lament over Smyrna* (still extant, a mere string of exclamations) induced the emperor to rebuild the city. The beautiful passage, 'The evening winds blow only over a wilderness' is said to have moved Marcus Aurelius to tears. Although it is impossible to decide what is false and what is true in Philostratus, how much is misrepresentation, exaggeration or pure imagination, it is impossible to doubt the extraordinary affability of the emperors to the sophists during the second (and part of the third) century, or the interest taken by them in their art; this alone would be sufficient to justify us in assuming that the same interest was shown by the entire educated world of Rome, which is confirmed beyond suspicion by further evidence.

One of the founders of the new art, the Assyrian Isaeus, made his appearance in Rome shortly before the year 100. The impression produced by his powerful flow of language is shown by the description of the younger Pliny. 'The great fame of Isaeus had already preceded him here. He possesses the utmost readiness, copiousness, and abundance of language. He always speaks extempore, and his lectures are as finished as though he had spent a long time over their written composition. His style is Greek, or rather the genuine Attic. His exordiums are terse, elegant, attractive, and occasionally impressive and majestic. He suggests several subjects for discussion, allows his audience their choice, sometimes even to name which side he shall take, rises, arranges himself and begins. At once he has everything almost equally at command. Recondite meanings of words are suggested to you, and words—what words they are, exquisitely chosen and polished! These extempore speeches of his show the wideness of his reading, and how much practice he has had in composition. His preface is to the point, his narrative lucid, his summing-up forcible, his rhetorical ornament imposing. In a word, he teaches, entertains and affects you. His reflections (enthymemes) are frequent, his syllogisms also are frequent, condensed and carefully finished. He repeats from a long way back what he had previously delivered extempore, without missing a single word. This marvellous faculty he has

acquired by dint of great application and practice, for night and day he does nothing, hears nothing, says nothing else. He has passed his sixtieth year and is still only a rhetorician ' (Melmoth). After this description we may literally believe the statements of Philostratus, that the enmity of the two sophists Favorinus and Polemo was kept up by the fact that consuls and consuls' sons took sides in the quarrel ; that the sophist Hadrianus excited such admiration that knights and senators crowded into the Athenaeum to hear him, even those who knew no Greek.

The scanty fragments of Roman literature in the second century after Hadrian show clearly enough that the great effects of sophistical rhetoric, promoted energetically by the lectures of the Greek professors at Rome, were not without influence on literary effort in the educated Roman world. Perhaps the very reason of the scantiness of these fragments is that many Romans, dazzled by the charm of the new Greek prose, were led to write in Greek instead of in Latin. Marcus Aurelius undoubtedly chose the first language as the result of his study of the works of the Greek philosophers in the original ; but one of the most unmistakable symptoms of the influence of the Greek sophists on the literary circles of the Roman world is the fact that Favorinus of Arelate (Arles) and Claudius Aelianus of Rome (or Praeneste) equally desired to shine as stylists not in their mother tongue but in Greek ; and in fact they are included amongst the most prominent Greek sophists. We only possess the works of three Roman prose writers of this period. One of these, Aulus Gellius, who was content to offer the public nothing more than a collection of learned and amusing miscellanea, hardly deserves to be called a literary man, although his studied elegance, especially in narrative, shows that he imitated contemporary Greek models. His great friend Herodes, ' famous for his graceful intellect and Greek eloquence ', had published similar learned collections. Fronto, the admirer of Polemo, tried his hand at several of the forms in which the sophists were accustomed to display their art, such as a mincing narrative style, and especially letters, some written in his own name, others in the name and character of persons of the most different position and class. Some of his extant letters are in Greek. His eulogies of dust, smoke and idleness are an attempt to discuss injurious, contemptible

and useless things and qualities in the paradoxical manner of the sophists.

Lastly, Apuleius, who, as he himself says, had thoroughly familiarized himself with Greek culture at Athens, made it his life's task to do for Latin prose what the sophists had done for Greek. The combination of philosophy and eloquence, to which he chiefly owed his reputation among contemporaries and posterity, was not uncommon in the Greek sophists. Like them, he journeyed from place to place, delivering lectures prepared in advance (a carefully elaborated collection of brilliant passages and introductions has been preserved); like them, he made use of his art in the courts. Even his chief work, the *Metamorphoses* or *The Golden Ass*, is nothing but a sophistical show-piece; for the sophists also made use of this form, in order to display the advantages of the art of treating various subjects in prose. Similarly, in the *Metamorphoses*, the exposition of the art was the end, the subject was only the means. Like the Greek romances, that of Apuleius consists only of a loosely-connected series of scenes and adventures of all kinds, which afford the author an opportunity of exhibiting his art, now in comic or tragic, indecent or horrible stories, now in descriptions of scenes from nature and of works of art, now in dialogues and speeches.

The attempt of Apuleius to transplant the art of the Greek sophists into the soil of Roman literature is the most striking proof of the extraordinary influence exercised by the new Greek art over the educated western world; but at the same time all his works show how the ascendancy of this form lessened the previous importance of poetry. No one will dispute that Apuleius possessed natural poetical gifts to a higher degree than the majority of the post-Augustan poets whose works are known to us. The choice of a popular story (*Cupid and Psyche*) as a subject and the affection with which he handles it show an appreciation, certainly rare at the time, of the wild flowers of poetry, which the poetical horticulturists and their admirers in their arrogance pretended to ignore. Certainly, Apuleius also tried his hand at poems of all kinds—epics, lyrics, comedies, tragedies, satires and riddles; but he sought and acquired his reputation in prose alone. A hundred or fifty years earlier he would most probably have been distinguished as a poet; but as the prevailing tendency of former times

had been strong enough to entice even sober pedants like Pliny into the paths of poetry, so now it was the art of prose that irresistibly attracted talent and even succeeded in detaching it from the sphere which suited it so admirably. Nevertheless, Apuleius showed himself unusually successful in maintaining the double part of a poetical rhetorician and a rhetorical poet.

With the renascence of ancient culture, the poetry of the Augustan and post-Augustan age regained the high esteem it had enjoyed in antiquity. While Homer, Pindar, Aeschylus, Sophocles and Theocritus continued for centuries to be little known and still less understood, Virgil, Horace, Ovid and Juvenal were generally reckoned as the highest models. But the restoration of the authority and influence of Roman poetry over education in general reintroduced many phenomena, the result of the attitude of the educated world of later antiquity to poetry. At first humanism re-established the intimate connexion of poetry with science and learning ; its study was regarded as an important, nay, an indispensable means of education, and skill in the management of its forms and expressions as the finest flower of a noble education ; the humanists were with justice called simply 'poets' by both friends and enemies. Melanchthon, in a letter to Micyllus (1526), says : 'No one who has not practised poetry can form a correct judgment in any department of science ; and prose writers, who have no flavour of the poetic art, are wanting in vigour'. The humanists considered poetry as an art that could be learnt and acquired, like any other, by industry and practice. At the same time poetry resumed its mission of adorning the life of the privileged and of investing all its important moments with a greater solemnity. Poetry continued to be a regular subject of instruction at the universities, and was frequently the life-long companion, a decorous amusement and recreation, of those who had received a superior education. Even occasional poetry, both official and non-official, maintained an importance which is hardly intelligible at the present day. It was not till after the middle of the eighteenth century that the great intellectual revolution took place, which set before poetry (and art in general) as its aim the release of the human soul from the sombre empire of passion. This mighty movement, which caused so powerful a reaction from artificiality and conven-

tionalism of form has rendered us capable of understanding the Greeks, Shakespeare and popular poetry ; it has also, in consequence of the complete change of the attitude of the educated world towards poetry, created a less favourable estimate of the Roman poets, not so pronounced, however, amongst the Romance as amongst the Germanic peoples.

CHAPTER II

RELIGION

I THE BELIEF IN GODS (POLYTHEISM).

We possess two different and in many respects even contradictory authorities for the state of religion in the ancient world during the first centuries of the Christian era: literature and monuments (especially inscriptional stones). The literature was chiefly the work of unbelievers or indifferentists, or of those who strove to spiritualize, purify, or transform the popular beliefs by reflection and interpretation. The monuments, on the other hand, to a great extent at least, had their origin in those classes of society which were little affected by literature and its prevailing tendencies, and felt no need, or indeed were not capable, of expressing their convictions on such matters; thus, in the majority of cases, they are witnesses of a positive belief in a system of polytheism, of a faith that is free from doubt and subtlety alike, naïve and ill-considered. Should the modern world ever perish like the ancient, and should future generations attempt to form an idea of the religion of our time from remains of modern civilization as fragmentary as those of antiquity, they would obtain quite a different (and in some respects contradictory) impression from our literary remains than from gravestones, votive tablets, and other ecclesiastical monuments. If, then, it would only be possible in our case to arrive at an approximately correct idea by utilizing two mutually complementary classes of evidence, this is equally true of the period of antiquity under consideration. While its heathen literature affords us a glimpse of the activity of the forces which were working in the heart of paganism itself for its dissolution and decomposition, the monuments breathe a spirit of belief which for centuries was able to resist all destructive influences. But

inasmuch as the literature of the period, both Christian and pagan, has been utilized almost exclusively, or at least far more extensively (especially by theological writers) than the monuments, the latter have never received all the attention they deserve.

Even literature has not been made use of impartially ; its irreligious side has been chiefly taken into account, without any adequate consideration of the extent to which not only belief, but also superstition, are needs of the masses which peremptorily demand satisfaction. Even the literary authorities only partly confirm the prevalent idea, that paganism was already in a condition of utter decay and complete dissolution, at the time of the birth of Christianity.

Certainly, during the last century before the Christian era, many complaints (perhaps not so many as in the nineteenth century) of a diminished fear of God, of unbelief and religious indifference, are made by Greek and Roman writers, who expressly attributed the decay of religion to the theories of an ' insane creed ', propagated by the schools of Greek philosophy. In fact, the Roman literature of that period and of the first century after Christ is dominated by tendencies partly deviating from the old belief, and partly directly hostile to it. The necessity for popular belief and a state religion was not only readily admitted by the educated classes on the ground of expediency ; they themselves set the example of respect for religion and all religious institutions. Cicero, in a speech delivered in the senate (*De Haruspicum Responsis*), declared that, with all his fondness for literary studies, he would have nothing to do with such literature as alienated men's minds from religious belief ; we owe, says he, our world-wide victories to piety, religion, and the knowledge that everything is directed by the will of the gods. In particular it was recognized that the masses, by reason of the crudeness of their morals and lack of education, were in need of religion. It is impossible, says Strabo, to lead the mass of women and the common people generally to piety, holiness and faith simply by philosophical teaching ; the fear of God is also required, not omitting legends and miraculous stories. The existence of gods has its uses, says Ovid with cynical frankness ; since this is so, let us believe in them and continue to sacrifice to them. Epictetus blames those who by thoughtless expressions of

doubt as to the existence of the gods destroy the seeds of virtue in youthful minds and rob many of what has preserved them from crime. Further, statesmen under the empire were specially emphatic in declaring that those who despised the gods were people who respected no one else.

Such a confession undoubtedly implied that a large number of educated men thought there was no need of popular belief in its traditional form, of which, as a matter of fact, they frequently spoke with indifference, frivolity or contempt. Certainly, this free-thinking was often only a mask; misfortune or danger tore it from the scoffer's face, who then turned eagerly to religion for assistance. It was also no uncommon occurrence for absolute unbelievers to cling the more obstinately to an isolated superstition; e.g. Sulla, who plundered the temple at Delphi, always carried about with him a little image of Apollo, which he frequently kissed, and to which he addressed fervent prayers in moments of danger. Of course many educated men were believers, and Juvenal even expresses the opinion that in his time there was no man who despised the gods.

Yet we also find (in Lucretius) a passionate expression of hatred of religion. To him it appeared a gigantic spectre, towering from earth to heaven, beneath whose heavy foot human life lay prostrate on earth, while its hideous face looked down threateningly from on high. But at last a Greek (Epicurus) boldly defied the terror. He threw open the portals of nature, penetrated far beyond the flaming walls of the universe into the infinite, and as a conqueror brought back the knowledge of the causes of all existence to mankind. Thus he has overthrown religion, but by his victory has exalted us to heaven. Let it not be thought that the acceptance of this doctrine leads to sin and godlessness; on the contrary, it is religion itself that has more frequently given birth to godless and unholy acts. The poet reminds us how Agamemnon sacrificed his own daughter Iphigenia to appease the wrath of the gods, and concludes his touching description of the death of the innocent maiden with the exclamation: 'So great the evils to which religion could prompt!'

But the school of Epicurus, to say nothing of the philosophically educated generally, was by no means so hostile to popular religion as Lucretius. No system taught atheism,

the advocates of which were hardly ever numerous. Scepticism only disputed that the existence of the divinity could be proved ; Epicureanism taught the existence of countless and eternal gods, living in a state of supreme felicity, and only denied their solicitude for the world and humanity ; but they no more abstained from worship on principle than the sceptics. The deity needs no adoration of ours, says the Epicurean Philodemus, but it is natural for us to render him this homage, chiefly by lofty ideas, but also by following in every case the custom of our fathers. In accordance with custom, says the sceptic Sextus, we affirm that there are gods who exercise supervision over human affairs, and we pay them reverence. The majority of educated men, who belonged to no definite school, but were directly or indirectly affected by philosophical influences, were more or less tolerant of the popular beliefs, although they might themselves have held monotheistic, pantheistic or fatalistic opinions, embraced a purified polytheism, or abandoned the traditional belief without having been able to find another to replace it.

Outside philosophical circles proper, the religious views current in the educated Roman world of the first century A.D. fluctuated between belief in the existence of the popular gods and a providence of which they were the agents (although the entire legendary tradition was rejected) on the one hand, and an absolute negation of these gods on the other. The former appears to have been the point of view, e.g. of Tacitus. In discussing the Jewish religion, he expresses the most decided antipathy to all that tended to neglect of the hereditary worship and to contempt of the gods. He believed that they not only carried out the unalterable laws of nature, but also directly interfered with the course of events, and announced the future by omens. Quintilian was one of that very numerous class which combined polytheistic views, the result of habit and education, with monotheistic, neither possessing the energy to define its convictions with clearness and precision, nor feeling the need of so doing. In his case the idea of animated nature, of ' the god, who is the father and creator of the world ', thrust belief in the ' immortal gods ' into the background ; but he firmly believed in a Providence, and also apparently in the prediction of the future by oracles and signs.

The elder Pliny is the most decided in his negation of the

popular belief. Thinking that he ought not to pass over, in his description of the Cosmos, 'the incessantly discussed question of the essence of the divinity', he has recorded the answers most commonly given at the time. So far as he himself is concerned, God and nature are inseparable; he regards nature as 'the mother of all things', who so often reveals herself to man in chance, which one might be tempted to designate as the deity to whom discoveries and progress are chiefly due. But reason leads us to regard as the real divinity the 'sacred, boundless and eternal' Cosmos, which is at the same time 'the work of nature and nature herself'; the soul and guiding principle of the world being the sun. Consequently it is only weakness that makes men inquire into the image and form of the divinity. Whoever the divinity may be (if indeed one exists outside nature), and wherever he may dwell, he must be all strength, all mind. It is even more foolish to believe in innumerable gods and to deify human qualities, such as concord, chastity, hope, honour and clemency; mankind, weak and weary, conscious of its own infirmity, has split up the divinity, so that each man may worship that aspect of him of which he chiefly stands in need. Hence we find the same gods worshipped under different names among different peoples, and an infinite number of gods amongst the same peoples, even diseases and evils, such as fever and orphanage, being worshipped from fear. Now since in addition there exists a belief in tutelary gods and goddesses of all individual men and women, there would seem to be more gods than human beings. Mythology is nothing but childish drivel; it is the height of impudence to attribute to the gods adultery, strife and hatred, and to believe in divinities of theft and crime. Revelation of the divinity consists in man working for humanity, and this is the path of eternal glory in which the heroes of ancient Rome formerly walked, and in which, following in the footsteps of the divinity, Vespasian and his sons still walk, lending aid to the exhausted world. It is a very ancient custom to show gratitude to the benefactors of humanity by elevating them to the rank of gods. As a rule the names of the gods, like those of the stars, are borrowed from men; for how could there be a list of celestial names? Can it be believed that the supreme power, whatever it be, takes thought for human affairs? would it not

be degraded by so melancholy and complicated a task ? How can we decide whether it be more profitable for the human race to hold this belief or not, when we see that some take no heed of the gods, while others live in awe of them or are the slaves of disgraceful superstition ? To make the idea of the divinity still more uncertain, mankind has invented a power intermediate between two opposite conceptions of it. This is Fortune, the ever-shifting, wandering, inconstant, uncertain, changing, generally regarded as blind, the patroness of the unworthy ; consequently, chance [1] itself is honoured as a goddess. Others reject even this principle, and assign all events to their constellations, and believe that the decrees of the divinity are issued irrevocably once for all. This view has begun to gain ground, and is eagerly approved of by a large number of persons, both learned and unlearned. Hence belief in countless portents embarrasses mankind, deprived of insight into the future, and the only thing certain is, that there is nothing certain, and that no creature exists that is more arrogant and at the same time more pitiable than man. Other creatures know no wants but those which kindly nature of itself supplies, and never think of death. But undoubtedly belief in the guidance of human affairs by the gods is beneficial to society, as also the conviction that evil deeds are infallibly punished, even if tardily, owing to the numerous claims upon the deity ; and that man cannot have been created next to God in order to be degraded to the level of the brutes. But even God cannot do everything ; herein lies a special comfort for man in his imperfect state. Even if he so desired, he cannot inflict death upon himself, the greatest blessing that nature has bestowed upon man amidst the many evils of life ; he cannot grant mortals immortality, or recall the dead to life ; he cannot bring it to pass that one who has lived has not lived, or that one who has filled offices has not filled them ; he has no power generally over the past except to cause it to be forgotten ; and (to use a less serious illustration) he cannot make twice ten not twenty, and the like. Hence the might of nature is indisputably proved, and is shown to be that which we call God. Such are the opinions of Pliny.

If the negation of the popular belief in most cases was directly or indirectly an effect of philosophical influences, there

[1] Reading *Fors* for *Sors*.

were also philosophical tendencies with which it was not merely completely reconcilable, but which even served to support it. Stoicism, which perhaps exercised a wider influence than any other system at that time, endeavoured to reconcile faith and philosophy in its theology, and to justify the popular religion scientifically by distinguishing the highest God, the creator and autocrat of subordinate gods, the divine power considered as a unity pervading the All, from their countless manifestations and their effects, and further assumed 'demons' as beings intermediate between gods and men. Everything, says Epictetus, is full of gods and demons. The offensive aspects of legendary tradition were removed by ingenious allegorical interpretations. In addition, Stoic theology recognized continuous revelations of the divine powers in the form of oracles, portents and the like; it may therefore be assumed that a large number of the followers of the Stoa adhered more or less strictly to the traditional belief, and that educated men like Marcus Aurelius, who would not live in a world without gods, preferred this school to all others, since it offered a solution of the conflict between faith and reason.

Consequently, even in the first century, those who had received a philosophical education were not altogether hostile to the popular religion. And although the literature of the period, like that of the eighteenth century, is dominated by tendencies hostile to belief, they did retain their influence beyond the century. The tide of the anti-Christian tendencies of the eighteenth century, after it had risen to its greatest height, sank rapidly and was succeeded by a powerful ebb, which irresistibly carried along with it a great part of the educated world. Similarly, in the Graeco-Roman world, we find the predominating tendencies of the literature of the first century succeeded by a strong reaction in the direction of positive belief, which gained the upper hand and affected the same circles; at the same time, belief itself frequently degenerated in many respects into crass superstition, a yearning for the miraculous, pietism and fanaticism.

The development of the theory of 'demons', also adopted by the Stoics and eminently characteristic of the religious tendencies of the period, by the Platonists after the first century, is the most striking proof of the need of bringing the popular belief into harmony with a purer theology—a need

more deeply and generally felt by the educated classes than ever before. The idea of this 'intermediate kingdom' of demons, founded upon the old Orphico-Pythagorean tradition, was developed in such a manner that philosophers who believed 'accepted the substitution of demons for popular gods, in all cases in which anything was asserted of the latter which was considered irreconcilable with the pure idea of God, while not desirous of absolutely denying it on that account'.

Although this offered the widest scope to imagination, the Platonists of the second century are completely in agreement upon all the essential points of demonology, which they regarded with marked favour; evidently the theory had already gained a kind of dogmatic authority amongst the believers of the educated world. Plutarch says: Those who have discovered the existence of a race of demons, beings intermediate between gods and men, who unite both and keep up the connexion between them, have solved more and greater difficulties by this doctrine (whether it originates from the school of Zoroaster, from Orpheus, from Egypt or Phrygia) than Plato by his theory of matter. According to Plutarch's view, any of the three lower classes of intelligent beings, in proportion as they attain perfection, can rise to the next higher, and finally to the highest class; the souls of the best men can become heroes, the heroes demons, and individual demons (such as Isis and Osiris) gods. For in the triple order of powers that are the agents of Providence the demons come last. The highest power is the intellect and will of the original divinity, creator and orderer of the universe from the beginning; next to him, the gods of heaven, the general directors of human affairs; and, lastly, the demons, special 'guardians and overseers'. Differing from other Platonists, Plutarch regards the demons as not necessarily immortal; he relates as an undoubted fact, personally vouched for by a trustworthy authority, how the news of the death of the great Pan was received by his fellow-demons with loud lamentations; the learned men at the court of Tiberius interpreted this as referring to Pan, the son of Hermes and Penelope. The demons are capable of likes and dislikes, and also liable to be affected by evil; the traditional stories of abduction, wandering, concealment, banishment and menial service that are told of the gods, the sufferings of Isis and Osiris and the like, in reality

do not refer to the gods, but to the demons. The latter are called by the name of the gods with whom they are associated, and are thus confounded with them ; some, however, have retained their real name. The evil and malignant demons rejoice in gloomy, mournful rites, and if these are accorded them they abstain from further mischief ; the good and kindly, as Plato has already taught, act as messengers and interpreters, who carry upwards to the gods the prayers and wishes of mankind, and bring down to earth oracles and divine blessings. Consequently the demons often descend from the regions of the moon to administer oracles, to take part in the celebration of the highest mysteries, to punish crimes, to bring deliverance in war and perils by sea ; if in so doing they allow themselves to be influenced by anger, partiality or jealousy, they are punished by being hurled down to earth again and transferred to human bodies.

Quite in the same sense Apuleius and Maximus of Tyre represent the demons as mediators between the world of gods and men. According to the former, their bodies are neither earthy nor purely ethereal, but something between the two. Hence it is only exceptionally and of their own will that they are visible to men, like the Homeric Minerva to Achilles. The poets truly represent these demons as lovers and haters of men, whom they favour or injure. Hence they feel pity, indignation, joy and sorrow, and are subject to all human emotions generally, all of which are quite incompatible with the eternally unchangeable tranquillity of the gods of heaven. Apuleius also explains differences of cult and sacrifice by differences of 'sensual' impressionability. In accordance with their nature, they delight in daily or nightly, public or secret, cheerful or gloomy sacrifices and rites ; thus the Egyptian demons take pleasure in dirges, the Greek in dances, the barbarian in noisy music. Hence the great diversity in the forms of religious worship in different lands : processions, mysteries, sacerdotal acts, prayers of those offering sacrifice, images and attributes of the gods, position and usages of temples, blood and colour of the victims. All these have their importance according to the custom of each country, and we often learn by dreams, prophecies and oracles that the deities (i.e. the demons) are wrath if anything in their worship is neglected through carelessness or arrogance.

With the exception of a few downright atheists, says Maximus of Tyre, all mankind is united in belief in one God, the king and father of all, and in many gods, his children and fellow-rulers ; the latter are not 30,000 in number, as Hesiod says, but as numerous as the natures of the stars in heaven, or as the demoniacal essences in aether. These divine beings, some visible, others invisible, share the sovereignty of the highest god ; those most akin to him gather round his gates as domestics and companions of his table, and serve him as messengers ; others are subservient to these ; others again play a still more subordinate part. Thus a continuous hierarchy of superhuman beings keeps up the connexion between the human and the divine, and the subordinate gods (the demons) act as interpreters and mediators between human weakness and divine sovereignty. ' It is they who appear to men, speak to them, associate with them, and render them the assistance which human nature always needs from heaven.' ' They heal sicknesses, give advice in trouble, reveal what is hidden, give help in work and guidance on the road ; some exercise their power in the towns, others in the country, some on land, others on sea ; others are protecting spirits of individuals ; some are terrible, others benevolent to man, fond of civil life or war ; the natures of demons are as numerous as the natures of men .' To these belong in particular human souls separated from the body, who are unwilling to abandon their earthly desires and occupations even in a higher existence ; thus Asclepius still practises the healing art, Heracles performs deeds of might, Dionysus continues his revels, Amphilochus prophesies, the Dioscuri journey on sea, Minos administers justice, Achilles arms himself. Maximus declares that he himself has seen the Dioscuri, like shining stars, guiding a storm-tossed ship, and that Asclepius appeared to him, not in a dream, but when he was awake. This makes it easy to understand how opponents of Christianity like Celsus refused to see any difference between the demons and angels of Christian and Jewish belief. Thus the theory of demons enabled the pious to hold firmly by the popular belief in its widest extent, without coming into collision with the demands of reason, and even in its literal sense, without having recourse to the violent and artificially allegorical interpretations of the Stoics, which were regarded with suspicion by the strictly

orthodox. In this roundabout way a large number of educated people returned to the 'legends and marvellous stories which seemed to have been finally disposed of by criticism, and, according to Strabo, were only necessary for the masses and the female sex. The search for and discovery of such a compromise between the popular religion and a more rational theology presupposes a widespread, indestructible attachment to the gods amongst the philosophically educated, an earnest longing to find satisfaction in the positive belief of former times which no abstraction, however sublime, could afford.

This is fully confirmed by the general impression produced by Greek and Roman literature in the second century, in which the religious standpoint of the educated world is reflected. Amongst Roman writers, Juvenal and the younger Pliny seem to have followed the Stoics most closely, both in general and in their religious views in particular; Pliny's strong belief in dreams and prognostics corroborates this. We also know that both took part in religious worship; Juvenal, in fulfilment of a vow, offered a dedication to Ceres Helvina, who was worshipped in his native town Aquinum; Pliny had a temple built. Tacitus struggled against grievous doubts, although (as already noticed) he never entirely broke away from religious belief. Suetonius' childish faith in portents and miracles leaves no doubt as to the firmness of his belief in the gods. In the case of Gellius, to judge from his general intellectual tendencies and those of his teachers in Greece, it may at least be considered probable that he strictly adhered to tradition in the matter of belief; Fronto, who when Faustina was ill prayed every morning to the gods and asked and received from them in dreams suggestions for curing the gout, undoubtedly did so. The *Self-Contemplations* of Marcus Aurelius breathe a spirit of genuine piety; the writings of Apuleius are pervaded by a mystic religious bliss; Aelian endeavoured by his own works to propagate his orthodoxy and infatuation for miracles, with which was combined a passionate hatred of unbelief.

But the Greek literature of the second century, far more than the Roman, bears the stamp of a period whose intellectual conditions were characterized by a newly awakened religious life. Amongst the Greek writers of this time, with the exception of Lucian, only Galen, with his pantheism founded on

Stoic ideas, stands aloof from the popular belief ; love, he says for example, is a purely human affection, and is not brought about by a little youthful demon with burning torches. Dio of Prusa is far nearer to the popular belief with his undoubting faith in the divinity (and apparently in individual gods) and a providence exercised by him ; he was even convinced that those who held reprehensible opinions on divine things were of necessity worthless and abandoned creatures. The pantheism of Epictetus also accepted polytheism, and his pupil Arrian appears to have adhered to the popular religion. All the other writers take their stand on a distinctly positive belief in the gods, however different in form and conception in each individual case. Plutarch did not consider it advisable to inquire into reasons for belief in the gods ; the old belief inherited from their fathers was a sufficient foundation for piety ; should it be shaken, its stability would be endangered. Further, there was hardly any limit to his belief in miracles, although he warns people against excessive credibility, and attempts a semi-rationalistic explanation of such marvels as the sweating, sighing and bleeding of images of the gods, and their speaking with human voice. Yet he asserts that divine nature is so entirely different from human, that it is not unreasonable to expect it to perform what is impossible for man. Pausanias' simple and orthodox faith, certainly sincere, even if deliberately adopted and artificially maintained ; Artemidorus' unshakable belief in miracles ; Maximus of Tyre's crass supernaturalism ; Aristides' enthusiasm, almost amounting to religious fanaticism—all agree in belief in a providence wonderfully exercised by numerous individual gods. Only a widespread blind belief and childish superstition could call forth the anti-religious writings of Lucian, whose indefatigable and repeated attacks could not be considered as merely ' a fight with shadows '. Still less does the fact that Lucian was not subjected to persecution allow us to infer a general indifference to the religion which he ridiculed. Although his ridicule no doubt deeply wounded the religious feeling of the orthodox, it could not appear so deserving of condemnation to them as the mockery of a religion based upon revelation must appear to those who believe in it. In paganism there were not only no dogmas, but not even a church, which might have interfered to protect the threatened faith against its

aggressors. Certainly Parny's *Guerre des Dieux*, which surpasses Lucian's *Dialogues of the Gods* both in wit and in cynical mockery of all that is most sacred, appeared (1799) in France before the restoration of Catholicism, but no attempt was subsequently made to suppress it; its author became a member of the *Académie française* in 1803, and died in 1814 without having been subjected to persecution.

The emperors of the second century also were evidently under the influence of the prevailing intellectual tendency, and on their part encouraged it by their example and their earnest solicitude for religion. Pliny praises Trajan because he did not, like Domitian, claim to be honoured like a god, but only entered the temples of the gods to worship them. Hadrian, even in the opinion of a man of such exaggerated pretensions in this respect as Pausanias, showed great zeal in his veneration for the gods. Antoninus Pius never allowed a sacrifice to be performed by a deputy; a memorial set up in his honour in 143 by senate and people is dedicated to him 'by reason of his unusual and scrupulous conscientiousness in regard to the usages of the state religion'. Marcus Aurelius strove in every respect to follow the example of his predecessor, especially his piety and freedom from superstition, that he might be able to meet death with an equally clear conscience. He himself, who did not care to live in a world without gods, appears to have recognized the gods of all nations as equally powerful and equally worthy of reverence. When the war against the Marcomanni broke out he summoned priests from all countries to Rome and ordered them to perform foreign rites; during the war, by direction of an oracle of Alexander of Abonuteichos, two lions were thrown alive into the Danube by his orders. He was so extravagant in offering sacrifice that a message from the white oxen was sent to him: 'If thou shouldst conquer, we are lost!'

The nature of the newly awakened religious life of the second century must here be illustrated by a few specially characteristic phenomena, which will enable us to recognize to what an extent religious belief was strengthened. Claudius Aelianus of Praeneste, about the beginning of the third century, wrote two works in Greek on *Providence* and *Divine Manifestations*, the spirit of which may be gathered from numerous fragments. He endeavoured to prove 'that those

who assert that the deity does not exercise providence on earth are more foolish than children' by numerous stories of miracles, oracles and other direct revelations of divine power, especially miraculous rewards bestowed upon pious believers, or terrible and miraculous punishments of atheists and unbelievers. In these narratives he frequently apostrophizes those who despise religion: 'What do you say to this, you who think that Providence gropes blindly about, or is nothing but a myth?' Philosophers hostile to religion are by turns objects of pity and execration: 'O Xenophanes, Diagoras, Hippo, Epicurus and company, and all other miserable wretches hated of the gods, be ye accursed!'

A few specimens will give an idea how the insipid and unctuous language affects the pious simplicity of the good old days. 'Euphronius was a miserable fellow, who delighted in the gossip of Epicurus, which taught him atheism and wickedness.' This man had a severe attack of pneumonia, and, suffering greatly, at first called in the aid of a physician. But the art of the physician could do nothing to arrest the disease. When Euphronius began to fear the worst, his friends removed him to the temple of Asclepius. After he had fallen asleep there, it seemed to him that one of the priests told him that there was only one way of salvation and one remedy for the ills which oppressed him; he must burn the writings of Epicurus, knead the ashes of these godless, sinful and effeminate books with moist wax, smear his belly and breast therewith, and tie bandages round them. He told all that he had heard to his nearest relatives, who were full of joy, because he had not been rejected with contempt by the god. Thus the atheist was converted and was ever afterwards a model of piety for others. This book contained numerous instances of wonderful cures of both pious and godless men, accompanied by edifying remarks. 'Aristarchus of Tegea, the tragic poet, fell ill and was cured by Asclepius, who commanded him to bring a thank-offering. The poet brought the god the play named after him. But how can the gods demand and accept a reward for restoring a man to health? In their love and kindness they grant us the greatest blessings for nothing; they allow us to see the sun and to share the all-sufficing brightness of so mighty a god without reward; they give us the use of water and the countless productions and varied

assistance of fire to aid us in our work, and the vital nourishment of air. Consequently their only wish is that we should not be unmindful or ungrateful even in less important matters, and thereby, in fact, they make us better.'

The following story of a game-cock of Tanagra, which had been injured in one foot, may serve to show to what childish credulity this mania for miracles could lead. 'The cock, in my opinion impelled by Asclepius, came hopping on one leg to his master, and in the morning when a hymn of praise was being sung to the god he took a place in the choir as if it had been assigned him by the leader, and joined in the singing as well as he could, in perfect harmony with the rest. Standing on one leg, he held out the other, injured and mutilated, as if to show what he had suffered. Then he sang to his saviour with all his might and begged him to restore the use of his foot.' Having been healed in accordance with a revelation of the god, 'he flapped his wings, strutted about, lifted up his head, shook his crest like a proud warrior, and showed that Providence also watched over the brute creation'. In contrast with the stories of salvation as the result of faith, we find examples of the terrible consequences of unbelief and sin against the gods. A man, who 'with longing eyes' desired to look upon certain mysteries without having been initiated, climbed to the top of a stone, fell down from it and died. Another unhappy wretch, enervated by the doctrines of Epicurus, forced his way into the sanctuary of the temple at Eleusis, which no one but the hierophant might enter; as a punishment he was smitten by a fearful malady, and endured such dreadful torments that he longed to tear his accursed soul from his body. Sulla, who destroyed the temple of Athena at Alalcomenae, was slowly eaten by worms ('according to others, by lice'). Lastly, a Sculptor, 'who had eyes for gain only, not for piety', having received a sum of money to execute the statue of a god, produced a second-rate work, small and unsightly, in marble of inferior quality; he was afterwards punished in body, 'as an example to all and a warning never to do the like again for the sake of profit'.

Aelian was also the author of a *History of Animals*, in which 'the unerring instinct of the lower animals as a purer manifestation of nature is held up to mankind as a moral example'. Elephants worship the sun, stretching out their trunks to it,

like hands, when it rises ; but men doubt whether there are gods, or, if they exist, whether they have any care for us. The mice on an island in the Black Sea sacred to Heracles touch nothing which is dedicated to him ; when the grapes intended for his offerings are ripe they leave the island to escape the temptation of nibbling them, and do not return till the vintage is over. Hippo, Diagoras, Herostratus and the other enemies of religion would certainly no more spare these grapes than anything else which is dedicated to the gods. In another work Aelian praises the barbarians, who have not become alienated from the faith by excessive education like the Greeks ; amongst the Indians, Celts and Egyptians there are no atheists like Euhemerus, Epicurus, and Diagoras.

If the writings of Aelian acquaint us with the most extreme and unbending, indeed fanatical, orthodoxy of the pagan world, the confessions of the rhetorician Publius Aelius Aristides of Asia Minor, a man ranked by his contemporaries and posterity amongst the greatest intellects of his time, afford remarkable evidence of the intensity which religious exaltation could attain, when subject to special influences. Aristides, who was born about the year 129, came of a wealthy and distinguished family, and was the son of a priest of Zeus ; ailing from his youth, he early devoted himself with passionate eagerness to study. The nervous irritability of his delicate nature was fostered and heightened by excessive work and the excitement inseparable from the profession of sophist, which was more than any other adapted to develop most strongly his natural vanity and ambition. About 152 he was attacked by an illness, which lasted about twenty years, of which he has given a detailed account in the *Sacred Orations*, composed after his recovery (about 175). During this illness he developed a spirit of enthusiastic piety, which in course of time became concentrated upon a more and more exclusive veneration for the healing god Asclepius, compared with whom he regarded the rest of the gods as insignificant. Having frequented his temples and the society of his priests for years in the endeavour to find a cure for his disease, he thought of nothing else, whether awake or sleeping ; for, in accordance with the general belief, the god gave advice in dreams to those who sought his aid and passed the night in his temple. From that time the centre of Aristides' entire existence was his

dreams, which the god had commanded him to set down in writing. For Aristides the fulfilment of this command was a sacred duty ; when he was too weak to write, he dictated to others. Of course he followed all the instructions, even the most absurd, which he believed to have been given him in dreams, whereby he probably only aggravated his complaint ; he confesses that he grew weaker and weaker. Sometimes he imagined himself neither asleep nor awake, but between the two, in which condition he was corporeally conscious of the proximity of the god ; his hair stood on end, his eyes filled with tears of delight, and his heart swelled with pride—a state of mind which no one could describe, which the initiated alone know and understand. Amongst other things, the god ordered him to bathe in the river during the winter, in spite of frost and the north wind. After his bath he felt a wonderful relief : ' his temperature was even and natural ; a gentle warmth invigorated his entire body ; he had an indescribable feeling of comfort, in which everything gave way to the sensations of the moment ; he saw nothing, although his eyes were open ; he was absolutely with God '. However terrible his sufferings, he regarded them as nothing in comparison with the honour of which the god had deemed him worthy ; any one who rightly estimated it would consider that he deserved to be congratulated rather than commiserated.

Although the religious extravagance of Aristides is most intimately connected with his exaggerated pride, his statements remind us in more than one respect of the confessions of Christian pietists. We may refer to his continual self-contemplation, his self-exaltation and self-deception, his fixed idea that he was the recipient of special favour and that he was one of the god's elect, and the spiritual presumption which was the inevitable result. In a dream he saw the image of the god with three heads, entirely surrounded by a flame of fire (the heads excepted). The god signed to all the other worshippers to withdraw, but ordered him to remain. The enraptured Aristides exclaimed, ' O thou who hast no like ', meaning the god ; who replied : ' It is thou that I call ! ' ' These words, O lord Asclepius, are better than all human life ; all my sickness, all my gratitude are nothing to them ; they give me power to do what I will.' In another passage he says : ' I also was one of those upon whom the grace of the

god bestowed, not once but many times, a new life in different forms, and who therefore regard sickness as salutary.' He would not exchange what the god had granted him for all the so-called happiness of mankind.

Convinced that he was one of the god's elect, he saw the hand of the divinity in everything, and special dispensations of providence and miraculous happenings in every-day events. He believed that the god accompanied him at every step, summoned, dispatched or detained him, gave him commands and commissions, or forbade him to do this or that. When Smyrna was destroyed by an earthquake, he writes to the two emperors that it was the god that drove him forth from the city and conducted him to a place of safety. It was the god who, contrary to all expectation, saved his old nurse Philumenē, whom Aristides dearly loved, on numerous occasions, once from a serious illness. After the death of another Philumenē, the daughter of his foster-sister Kallitychē, it was revealed to him in a dream that she had sacrificed body and soul for him. Her brother Hermias also, the dearest of his wards, 'so to speak nearly died for him'; he died, as Aristides afterwards learnt, on the very day on which he recovered from an attack of the great epidemic (subsequently communicated to the west by the soldiers of Verus). 'Thus my life hitherto was a gift from the gods, by whose divine aid I afterwards received a new life, as compensation for the old.' At that time 'the saviour (Asclepius) and lady Athene had visibly preserved him'; the latter had appeared to him in the form of the statue of Phidias, a sweet perfume was wafted from her *aegis*, he alone saw her, and called out to two friends and his nurse, who were present; they thought he was mad until they recognized the power emanating from the goddess and heard her words, as he had done. Monks of the middle ages, who read the discourses of Aristides, expressed in marginal notes their indignation at the folly, nay, the insanity of the man, 'who had a reputation for wisdom', and yet could abandon himself to such childish fancies.

The religious reaction against the influences of criticism and philosophy, the complete restoration of a positive belief in the gods in the minds of the educated, is proved by the phenomena already described. The fact itself shows that the lamentations over the supposed decay of belief were only caused by

the superficial and strictly limited tendencies of the age, which were driven back by powerful counter-tendencies. But there is nothing to show that the tendencies hostile to religion, even when strongest, ever spread beyond the narrow limits of educated circles. To all appearance they never made a deeper impression on the masses than the anti-Christian literature of the eighteenth century on the Christian belief of the European peoples in general.

The monotheistic, pantheistic and atheistic views of the world, so eloquently pleaded by their supporters in the literature of the first century, left the belief of the people in the old gods firmly rooted in the spiritual life of millions, untouched or at least unshaken. Despite all the alterations and developments, all the losses, disturbances and amplifications which affected religion, it held its ground and ever renewed itself in its two main forms. The first, prevalent in eastern lands, had developed within the Greek world ; the second, that spread over north and west as far as the influence of Roman civilization extended, had its origin in a mixture and fusion of Greek and Italian elements that it took centuries to complete. In both forms belief in the gods maintained itself for nearly five hundred years against Christianity, by which it was finally overwhelmed. So protracted a resistance is alone sufficient to prove the still unweakened vitality of the old belief. This vitality is equally manifest in the adoption and assimilation of numerous heterogeneous, even opposing religious elements, which, however, were unable to alter its character or to bring about its dissolution or decomposition. Lastly, by its continued creative productivity polytheism showed that it was still a living force.

Undoubtedly the adoption *en masse* of heterogeneous religious elements has been generally regarded hitherto as a symptom and cause of the decay of Graeco-Roman religion. Such a view, however, would only be justified if it could be proved that the belief in the old gods had been abolished, shaken, or essentially changed by the worship of new, foreign deities. No such effect is perceptible. There is no more reason to maintain that the mere increase in the number of the divinities of a polytheistic system presupposes a decline of faith or a weakening of its intensity, than that the fresh canonizations of the Catholic Church were due to a disappear-

ance of belief in the old saints, or that they were in any way prejudicial to it. Certainly the contrast between Oriental and Graeco-Roman cults is so profound, that a union of the two is difficult to understand. To our way of thinking, the former, as compared with the latter, appear strange and singular, and in some respects monstrous ; and the contrast between the religious ideas on which cults and usages are founded in the two cases seems even greater. Gloomy, melancholy and mysterious ceremonies, extravagant ecstasy, self-renunciation and unlimited devotion to the deity, self-sacrifice and expiation as conditions of purification and consecration—all these elements were originally as foreign to Greek and Roman belief as they were most deeply rooted in all Oriental religions. Most sharply contrasted with this, and characteristic of Greek and Roman faith and cult, is the fixed limitation of the idea of God, the clear view of the world of gods, the relation of believers to the divinity, free from all excess, confidential and strictly regulated, the general accessibility, unpretentious simplicity, and cheerfulness of the religious services. And yet Greek and Roman believers never found these profound contrasts an absolute hindrance to amalgamation. It is well known that Oriental elements made their way into Greek religion at a very early date ; into Rome at least after the second Punic war. If such was the result of a superficial contact of nations, their intimate union and fusion in the world-wide empire of Rome must of necessity have resulted in a mixture of gods in the widest extent, unaccompanied, however, by any alteration in the nature and intensity of religious belief. The world of gods, from the first to the last days of paganism, was and continued to be a domain only very imperfectly known to believers, since the light of revelation had never been thrown upon it ; the belief that it could contain the most varied figures and manifestations was the more natural, since one of the essential attributes of the deity was the power of assuming any form at will. With this unlimited power of expansion in ancient polytheism was combined the tendency, already emphasized to a surprising extent in Herodotus, to recognize native gods in foreign ones. This tendency so completely dominated pious believers that it only allowed them to perceive what was really or apparently similar in the different religions, and completely blinded them to the sharpest and most glaring contrasts.

It was ever characteristic of ancient polytheism to endeavour to supplement its own imperfect knowledge of God by the cults of foreign nations ; in Greece, as in Rome, entirely heterogeneous cults were adopted at times when the idea of a diminution of the power of religious belief cannot be entertained. The fact that this was less frequently the case in earlier antiquity is clearly not to be explained by a stronger national belief at that time, but by the more restricted intercourse between nations. As such intercourse developed, the exchange of cults proportionately increased and multiplied. The ancient world and its polytheism entered upon their last phase with the establishment of the universal empire of Rome. The incessant wanderings and movements, the continual ebb and flow of the inhabitants of this enormous expanse of territory, brought about an unexampled and promiscuous intermixture of races and nations with their religions and cults. From the Thames to Mount Atlas, from the Atlantic to the Euphrates, all the provinces contained worshippers of Isis and Osiris, Baal, Astarte and Mithras, who deliberately or by their example spread the worship of their gods ; and in this manner these and other Asiatic nature divinities, under different names and with different forms of ritual, gained countless proselytes. Memorials have been found relating to the cult of the so-called Jupiter of Dolichē in Commagēnē, a sun-god identical with Bel, worshipped at Palmyra, in Dacia, Pannonia, Noricum and Raetia, Germany and Gaul, Britain, Numidia and Dalmatia ; the largest number is in Italy (twenty-nine, of which twenty-one were found in Rome, where in the second and third century this god had a sanctuary on the Aventine and another on the Esquiline). Throughout the Roman empire the cults of Egyptian divinities were most widely spread ; they made their way to the East (where their monuments are most numerous, especially in the Crimea) directly from Egypt, to the west and north by way of Italy (especially Aquileia, where a district was called after Isis and Osiris). Even in the Rhine lands they are frequently mentioned on monuments. A figure of Isis in Jura limestone, most probably belonging to the first century, made into a romanesque capital in the church of St. Ursula at Cologne, perhaps came from a chapel of the goddess in that city. Egyptian monuments of all kinds, especially statuettes of Apis, Ushebtis (little models of de-

ceased persons in the form of mummies), and scarabs found there or in the neighbourhood, may have been set up in this or other sanctuaries, in order to give them an appearance of genuineness, without any real appreciation of their actual significance. Altars of Isis and Serapis have come to light in different places ; the gravestone of an Egyptian named Horus, son of Pabek, who served in the Roman fleet, at Cologne. Chnodomar, King of the Alemanni (defeated by the Emperor Julian in 357) gave his son Agenarich the name of Serapio because, when detained as a hostage in Gaul, he had been initiated into 'Greek secrets' (i.e. the mysteries of Isis). These cults penetrated into the most remote mountain valleys ; in the Non valley in the southern Tirol, during the festivals of Isis and Serapis, the mourning of the goddess for her lost spouse was represented.

If there can be no doubt that in many individual cases the new cults drove the old into the background, such local or individual preference for certain divinities could no more than at any other time effect any permanent alteration in religious belief as a whole. Even individuals who, as a rule, did not aspire to a comprehensive worship of the entire world of gods, but confined themselves more or less exclusively to certain particular divinities, could very well combine the national and foreign cults without prejudice to the former. Domitian was a worshipper of Isis and Serapis, to whom he built temples at Rome ; according to Pliny, even at his table his guests were struck by 'practices due to foreign superstition'. Nevertheless he insisted that no violation of the traditional worship should go unpunished ; and Martial says that during his reign the honour of 'the ancient temples' was preserved, although the emperor himself displayed a 'superstitious veneration' for Minerva before all other divinities.

The constant change in religious conditions was accompanied by a similar change in the idea of superstition, by which was understood an erroneous belief chiefly founded upon an exaggerated awe of God, but especially idolatry and the worship of foreign divinities not considered worthy of recognition by the state. Hence the idea of superstition must have been at all times not only relative, but infinitely varied, according to each individual conception of it. The worship of the Egyptian divinities was forbidden by the senate in 58

B.C. as a 'disgraceful superstition', and their altars were destroyed; but the prohibition had no more effect than the repeated interference (in 53 and 48) with the same worship, which at that time had already made its way to the Capital, or the banishment of the deities from Rome by Agrippa in 21 B.C. and the persecution of their votaries under Tiberius in 19 A.D. The fact that they had ever been considered inferior to the Roman divinities was gradually forgotten. Minucius Felix speaks of their cult and that of Serapis as 'a cult that was formerly Egyptian, but is now Roman.'

Like the Egyptian, many other Oriental cults, which had been at first generally despised as superstitious, were gradually accepted by increasing numbers on a footing of equality with the national cults, as handed down by tradition from time immemorial. The time necessary for naturalization no doubt depended in each individual case on the most various, and in part incalculable, influences; but first and foremost on the intimacy, continuity, and extent of the relations between the votaries of the two religions. The cult of the Persian Mithras, the god of light, with which the Romans first became acquainted in the war against the pirates, was already in existence in the reign of Tiberius, but did not come into vogue until after the time of Hadrian and the Antonines. Thus it probably took about the same time as the Egyptian cults (known to the Romans about 150 years earlier) to obtain its widest recognition. Mithras monuments have been found in large numbers from the mouth of the Danube to the north of Britain and on the borders of the Sahara, the largest and most interesting of them in Germany. His cult may not have enjoyed such esteem as that of the Egyptian divinities, but Origen certainly exaggerates when he calls it obscure in comparison.

Many cults may have been for a longer time looked upon as superstitious because their practices appeared particularly strange and singular, repulsive or ridiculous. Plutarch, who regarded all the peculiarities of the Egyptian worship as worthy of reverence, despised a number of Asiatic religious customs as superstitious, especially rolling in mire, keeping the sabbath, prostration, and other 'ridiculous exercises and tortures, speeches and gestures, the result of fear of the gods, juggleries and enchantments, vagabondage, drum-beating,

impure purifications, dirty mortifications, barbarous and illegal punishments and outrages in the temples'. The fact that long familiarity with the Egyptian cults had removed the foreign atmosphere which still surrounded others, essentially contributed to this difference of opinion; to all appearance the conception of a foreign cult as a contemptible superstition or a venerable religion depended upon the length of time it had been known. According to Suetonius, Augustus showed the greatest reverence for the old and recognized foreign cults (such as the Eleusinian mysteries), but treated the rest with contempt. But if Suetonius includes the Jewish faith amongst the cults despised by him, he is in error. Augustus (so also Livia) not only sent valuable dedicatory gifts for the temple at Jerusalem, but instituted the sacrifice of a daily burnt offering in his name, consisting of two rams and a bull, the discontinuance of which before the outbreak of the Jewish war was the first act of open revolt against Rome.

Further, the judgment passed upon foreign cults may have been affected to a certain extent by the relative importance of the people who professed them. Enlightened Romans, at least, could have had no hesitation in despising the cult of a remote, unknown and barbarous people. A veteran, who entertained Augustus at Bononia, was asked by the prince whether it was true that the first person who had plundered the temple of the goddess Anaïtis (worshipped in Armenia, Cappadocia and Media) had been struck blind and died a paralytic. The veteran replied that he himself was the guilty person, that all his fortune came from the plunder of the temple, and that Augustus had just dined on one of the legs of the goddess. The increasing admixture of nationalities in the Roman Empire continually extended the sphere of influence of foreign cults, and a much smaller proportion of them were regarded as mere superstitions by the orthodox. Although this admixture of gods did not reach its height until the third century, it had already made great progress about the middle of the second century. Hadrian, who showed the greatest respect for Roman and Greek cults, 'despised foreign cults'; no definite statement is made, but the Egyptian certainly cannot be included. During the reign of Marcus Aurelius, however, who, at the time of the general alarm caused by the Marcomannic War, summoned priests from all countries

and ordered them to perform foreign rites and all kinds of expiatory ceremonies in the city of Rome, the boundary line between foreign superstition and the national religion, both in Italy and Greece, was practically obliterated.

Certainly the ever increasing medley of the ' crowd of gods ' excited the mockery of unbelievers more and more. Lucian frequently makes the mixed society of the world of gods the object of his satire. At a meeting of the gods, Hermes is ordered by Zeus to arrange the gods according to the artistic merit and intrinsic value of their statues. Thus Bendis, Anubis, Atys, Mithras and an Asiatic moon-god are allotted the highest places, statues of gold being preferred to those of marble ; while, on the other hand, Atys and Sabazius, ' doubtful and alien gods', are placed at the end of the table at a banquet, by the side of Pan and the Corybantes. On another occasion the gods are discussing the claims of a number of candidates for admission to their company. Momus comes forward to speak and gives his opinion of the oriental divinities. He declares that Mithras, with his Median caftan and tiara, has no place in Olympus, he does not even know Greek and does not understand when his health is drunk. Still less ought the Egyptians to be tolerated ; the dog-headed, barking Anubis in his linen garment, the oracle-giving bull Apis, the ibises, apes and goats. Momus accordingly makes the following proposal : Seeing that many unauthorized strangers, both Greeks and barbarians, have forced their way into the company of the gods, that the supply of ambrosia and nectar has begun to fail, that the great demand for them has sent the price up to a *mina* a jar, that strange gods shamelessly push themselves forward and turn the old gods out of their places, let a commission of seven fully authorized gods be appointed to investigate the claims of each of their colleagues. Zeus does not put the proposal to the vote, foreseeing that the majority would be against it, but at once declares it carried, and instructs all the gods to provide themselves with the necessary certificates for the coming examination, such as the names of their parents, a statement of their nationality, and the manner in which they have been admitted amongst the gods, and so forth.

It is often believed that the feeling which prompted this satire, the feeling that the admixture of absolutely hetero-

geneous cults was contradictory and even absurd, must have been widespread, at least among educated circles, at the time ; but there is no proof of this, nor does the state of religious affairs throughout the empire justify this assumption. The impression made upon us coincides entirely with that of Lucian and his like, simply because their attitude towards these phenomena, like our own, was one of complete impartiality ; they regarded Greek and barbarian gods alike as equally unreal, and they were able to criticize these monstrous productions of the domain of mythology with entire and absolute freedom. But this was the feeling and judgment of unbelievers only, who to all appearance formed only a minority even amongst the educated.

But the clearest proof that even the most highly-educated were little shaken in their national belief by the admixture of gods is to be found in the religious opinions of Plutarch. Even he, the priest of the Pythian Apollo, was as sincere a worshipper of the Egyptian gods as of the Greek. In the treatise *On Isis and Osiris*, addressed to a highly-educated priestess of Isis at Delphi, he declares that the gods are everywhere the same, ministering forces of a supreme world-ruling power, known by different names and worshipped in different ways by different peoples. Thus, Isis and her fellow-divinities have been known from time immemorial to all men, although some have only recently learnt to call them by their Egyptian names ; when Hesiod names Eros, Ge, and Tartarus as the first things after Chaos, he appears to have meant Osiris, Isis and Typhon. The origin of the theory, that the world is ruled neither by blind chance nor by one supreme intelligence alone, but by many powers compounded of good and evil, is unknown and lost in obscurity ; but its high antiquity and the similarity of the traditional account amongst philosophers, poets, theologians and legislators, in mysteries and ritual, among barbarians and Hellenes, is a weighty testimony in favour of its truth. Osiris and Isis are good powers, Typhon an evil one ; as to this all are agreed, but theological speculations have arrived at the most different results in regard to their real and proper nature. Some explain Osiris as the Nile, others as the principle of moisture generally, others as Bacchus, others again as the lunar world, the kindly, fructifying, moist light. According to Plutarch, no one of these inter-

pretations by itself is correct, but all must be taken together to arrive at the truth. The enigmas of Egyptian theology, which he believed to be indicated by the rows of sphinxes before the temples, did not discourage him, but all the more provoked him to investigate their true meaning ; such investigation should be undertaken in a pious and philosophical spirit, since nothing is more agreeable to the divinity than that man should attain to a correct knowledge of his nature. Thus he became intimately acquainted with the most repulsive Egyptian legends and the most singular customs of the country, especially animal worship ; he also discovered in the Greek cult customs analogous to the festivals of lamentation, and a profound symbolism in the form and ornaments of the *sistrum* (rattle) so generally used in religious ceremonies in Egypt. But though absorbed in the consideration of the monstrosities of Egyptian belief and cult, Plutarch's attitude towards the national divinities was not in the least affected ; for him they continued to be not only living, but the same as they had ever been. His belief in them was certainly different from that of Herodotus, but equally robust and sincere.

If educated men could find room in their conscience for foreign by the side of national gods, without injury or alteration of the belief in the latter, this must have been still more the case with the masses, who were even less conscious of any absurdity in the simultaneous worship of the most heterogeneous divinities. So indestructible was the vitality of the old Graeco-Roman gods, that their forms, however blended or obscured, still remained the same, and their personality was in no way affected. For this reason, belief in them had such firm hold on the souls of men, since it was attached by so many roots to the state religion, to art and poetry, to school, and to civilization generally, from which it ever drew fresh nourishment. Pausanias, for instance, says that the multitude believes what it has heard from childhood in choruses and tragedies.

And further : of all the gods in the world they were the most human, and the human heart felt most irresistibly attracted to them. They were not transformed in the imagination of believers into barbarian gods, but the latter borrowed more or less of the personality of the Graeco-Roman gods, in many instances even their names. Mithras and Elagabalus

of Emesa became Sol (the sun-god); Astarte of Carthage sometimes 'the heavenly virgin', sometimes 'the heavenly Juno'; the gods of Heliopolis and Dolichē, Jupiter. Similarly, in Palestine and the neighbouring districts, the gods of Phoenicia, Philistia and other countries received the name and form of Greek gods: Marnas of Gaza (a god of the heights, who bestowed rain and fertility) was identified by the western settlers with Zeus; Aumu the Syrian with Helios; Dusaris, the Nabataean born of a virgin, with Dionysus. The Roman inhabitants of the originally Phoenician countries of Mauretania and Numidia worshipped the cruel Moloch even in public, apparently up to the second century, and in secret (according to Tertullian) sacrificed children to him under the name of 'Saturnus, the sublime giver of fruits', or 'Saturnus the invincible god'.

If, then, Graeco-Roman polytheism was still vigorous enough to assimilate the ancient and venerable gods of the old civilized countries of the East, this assimilation could not have presented the least difficulty when dealing with the rude and obscure gods of semi- or entirely barbarous countries. Numerous memorials in Britain, Germany, Pannonia, Gaul, Spain and Africa show that the Roman settlers, officials, merchants or soldiers zealously took part in the cults of the local deities. Augustus also, during a stay in Gaul, vowed and built a temple to the wind-god Circius, the lord and sender of storms, which, while they caused devastation, also purified the air, especially from the mistral of Provence. One characteristic example may here be mentioned. A Roman governor of eastern Mauretania offers thanks in an inscription for the annihilation of a native tribe, the carrying away of its families into captivity and the extensive plunder, not to a Graeco-Roman god, but to 'the native Moorish gods, the preservers'. These cults rarely won recognition beyond the bounds of their province or district, although no doubt retained or adopted by many individuals outside the same; thus Caracalla prayed to Apollo Grannus, in addition to Aesculapius and Serapis, to restore him to health.

If the merchants settled outside their home, especially the Syrians, who were to be found everywhere in such large numbers, acted above all as missionaries of oriental cults,

the soldiers, who everywhere held fast by the cults of their native lands in their garrisons, including the veterans in the military colonies, chiefly contributed to the spread of all cults foreign to the Greeks and Romans. A legate of Numidia and consul-designate, a native of Dalmatia, in 167 erected in the temple of Aesculapius at Lambaesis a statue of his native god Medaurus (on horseback, brandishing a lance). A veteran in another town of Numidia (Thubursicum) commends his son to Noreia, a native goddess of Noricum, the birthplace of the mother who had pre-deceased her son. . . In every garrison fellow-countrymen assembled together to worship the gods of their home. Thus, in the third century, the Thracians serving in the imperial guard at Rome appear to have had a special chapel for their native gods, Heron or Heros, Asclepius Zimidrenus, and others. Similarly, the Celtic guardsmen in Rome continued to sacrifice to Arduinna and Camulus, but especially to the 'mothers' and 'wives' (*matres*, *matronae*) of their home, supposed to be three in number, protecting goddesses of house and family, and also of whole communities and peoples, who bestowed prosperity, abundance and fertility. All their memorials in Rome, the majority of those in Britain, and a considerable number in Germany, are due to soldiers, simple legionary soldiers or veterans, rarely centurions and equestrian officers; the 'mothers', as is shown by the inscriptions of those who were not soldiers, were divinities of the common people. It is true that the Romans living in the provinces were in a measure content to worship these barbarian gods, without troubling about their name or nature (such as the 'mothers' and the kindred Suleviae). Thus they adored 'the great god of the Numidians' and 'the Moorish gods' (amongst whom were included princes of old times worshipped with divine honours); or they invoked them under the names by which they were usually known, such as Auzius, Bacax, Aulisua, whose names appear on the monuments of north Africa, or Laburus, Latobius, Harmogius and others, known from inscriptional stones of Noricum and Pannonia. Frequently, however, it was thought that under these barbarous forms were concealed native gods, whose names were then used side by side with the foreign-sounding names unpronounceable by Roman lips, or were simply substituted for them; thus Caesar calls

the chief Celtic gods, Teutates, Hesus and Taranis, respectively Mercury, Mars and Jupiter. Grannus of Alsace and the Rhine lands was identified by the Romans with Apollo; Belutucader and Cocid of Cumberland, Leherennus and Albiorix of southern France, and many other Celtic local gods, with Mars; Ataecina or Adaegina of Turobriga in the south of Spain, with Proserpina; Sulis, worshipped near the baths at Bath, with Minerva; Arduinna of the Ardennes and Abnoba of the Black Forest with Diana, and so forth. These Celtic divinities could not possibly have been identified with Graeco-Roman equivalents, if believers had ceased to regard the latter as real and living personalities.

The more a province became romanized, the more the native gods were not only driven out by the Roman but also transmuted into the latter. In Spain especially both these phenomena occurred. 'In the Iberian district, which even later remained tolerably free from immigration, in the west and north-west (Lusitania, Callaecia or Gallaecia, Asturia) the native gods with their singular names, chiefly ending in *icus-* and *-ecus* (Endovellicus, Caecus Vagodamaegus), maintained their ground in their old seats even under the empire. But throughout the south (Baetica) not a single votive stone has been found, which might not just as well have been set up in Italy; the same holds good of the east and north-east (Tarraconensis), except that isolated traces of the Celtic gods occur on the upper Douro.' The worship of non-Roman divinities persisted in the southern province of Gaul much longer than in southern Spain: 'in the great commercial city of Arelate (Arles) certainly the only dedications refer to Italian gods, but at Fréjus, Aix, Nîmes and in the coast-districts generally, the old Celtic divinities were worshipped in imperial times as much as in the interior of the country. In the Iberian portion of Aquitania, also, numerous traces occur of the native cult, entirely different from the Celtic.' Certainly, the barbarian gods sometimes differed so greatly from the Graeco-Roman that identification was impossible; such were some of the local Belgian divinities, as Cernunnus squatting with legs tucked under him, with a stag growing out of his head, or the goddess of Compiègne, with birds at the breast, or the three-headed god of Rheims.

However, faith could not only assimilate strange divinities

but could also create new ones, and this creative power is the most unmistakable proof of its undiminished energy and vitality. Not regarding the divine control of which he was so deeply conscious every day and every hour at every step, as a single united whole, but feeling the necessity of breaking up the infinite divinity into an infinite number of individualities, the believer elevated important phenomena and effects, which profoundly affected human life, into divine personalities.

The belief in a goodess of corn (Annona) and her cult do not seem to go farther back than the early empire, when the existence and safety of the eternal city depended upon the regularity and sufficiency of the supplies of grain from over sea. It was felt that it must be some divinity who gathered together the immense stores of Africa and Egypt, conveyed them safely across the sea, heaped them up mountains high in the storehouses of Rome, and, year in year out, provided daily bread for hundreds of thousands. On coins she first appears as a subordinate of Ceres, later as a separate goddess. 'Holy Annona' was certainly often invoked in fervent prayer, chiefly by those for whom in Rome the administration of the corn supply and the industries connected with it, and in the provinces the corn trade itself, provided occupation and a means of livelihood. A dedication to the holy Annona found in Rome is the work of a 'permanent measurer to the venerable corporation of wheat-flour bakers'; according to an inscription found at Rusicade (Philippeville), an export harbour of grain-bearing Numidia with state storehouses, intended for supplying Rome, a rich man had two statues set up, one 'of the genius of our native city', another 'of Annona of the holy city' (Rome).

Above all, the old Roman belief in genii involved a continual and unlimited increase of divine beings, as is sufficiently shown by the persistent vitality of this belief, and consequently of belief generally. The frame of mind which formed the basis of the latter continued to fill nature and existence with countless divine powers, whose mission it was to control and preserve, to generate and give life, to help and protect; these were the genii, whose favourite form was believed to be that of a snake. Every individual, every house and every family, every country, every city and province, legions, cohorts, centuries, corporations, guilds and unions—all had their

genius. But the feeling of piety, which saw 'in everything the trace of a god' and the hand of a divinity in every beneficent act and dispensation of providence, peopled every space with divine beings—wells, mountains, deserts, markets, palaces, warehouses, baths, archives and theatres. Every one who frequented these places paid homage to the genius or the 'guardian power (*tutela*) whether god or goddess'. The merchant, whose business took him to remote frontier lands, sacrificed there 'to the genius of the Roman people and trade'; the traveller in unknown and inhospitable countries 'to the god who invented roads and paths'. In the houses of Rome and other cities, as late as the fifth century, an image of the patron divinity, with a lighted candle or ever-burning lamp in front of it, was to be seen in the vestibule behind the door; the cult of the domestic gods (Lar, Genius, Penates), in spite of the prohibition issued against it, lasted far on into Christian times, during which angels soon took the place of genii. These minor divinities repeatedly proved their power to help within a definite sphere, and thus received special names and a more clearly defined personality; thus one of Trimalchio's guests, all belonging to the commercial class, swears by the holy 'Holdfast' (*Occupo*), and the Lares of the master of the house bear the names 'Profit', 'Good Luck', 'Gain' (*Cerdo, Felicio, Lucro*).

A necessary result of the change of the republic into a monarchy was that the genius of the reigning emperor took its place by the side of the genius of the Roman people, whose worship dated from very early times (at least as early as 218 B.C.). This appeared so natural and necessary that Augustus had no hesitation in undertaking the regulation of this cult himself. It was unavoidable that the idea of the imperial genius, worshipped as the tutelary deity of the people, should be confounded in the popular belief with the person of the emperor, who thus himself came to be regarded as the tutelary and controlling god. But although the belief in genii was not without influence on the deification of the emperor, the real home of the belief in the superhuman nature of the monarch was the East; together with the monarchy, it was transplanted from the Greek states of the East into the West.

From time immemorial distinguished men of merit in Greece had been venerated after their death as heroes (demi-

gods),—the founders of towns and colonies, the heroes of the Persian wars, the liberators of their fatherland (Harmodius and Aristogiton of Athens, Timoleon of Syracuse), also poets (Aeschylus, Sophocles), philosophers (Anaxagoras) and victors in the Olympian games. Occasionally, this elevation to the rank of heroes in course of time led to actual deification ; thus in Plutarch's time Lycurgus had a sanctuary in Sparta, in which sacrifice was offered to him 'as to a god'. Under Roman rule also, cities bestowed the honours of heroes upon prominent men after their death ; thus Mytilene honoured Theophanes, who had obtained from Pompey the privileges of a free state for the city, and Tarsus Athenodorus the meritorious Stoic, the teacher of Augustus. If in these and similar cases the choice of this manner of expressing gratitude was prompted by flattery and servility, there is no doubt that many (such as Apollonius of Tyana) were venerated after death owing to a sincere belief in their superhuman nature. How common the idea of the elevation of glorified spirits to a divine or semi-divine existence had become amongst the Romans is shown by Cicero's intention to build a temple to his daughter Tullia, who had died at the age of thirty-two. The Carpocratians, a gnostic sect of the first half of the second century, who reverenced Jesus together with the Greek philosophers as a model of supreme human purification, erected a temple in Cephalonia to Epiphanes, the seventeen-year-old son of their founder, after his death.

After the time of the Peloponnesian War, however, living persons also were worshipped as gods in Greece, the first known instance being Lysander, to whom Greek cities in Asia erected altars, offered sacrifice and sang paeans. Even the basest flattery would not have thought of this kind of homage had not the ancient Greeks, who were unable to imagine gods and men separated by an impassable gulf, been prone to see a being of a higher kind in every personality, which apparently or in reality was superior to the ordinary run of humanity. Nor was this way of looking at things entirely foreign to the Romans ; as a general rule, at meals libations were poured to Marius, the conqueror of the Cimbri and Teutones, as if he had been a god. The belief in the divinity of individuals also occurs outside the Graeco-Roman world. Amongst the Getae the prophet Decaeneus or Dicineus,

the adviser of King Boerebistes (Burvista ; 60–50 B.C.), who dwelt in a cave on a sacred mountain, was regarded as a god ; Strabo calls him an impostor. The Boian Mariccus, who in 69 A.D. undertook to liberate Gaul from the Roman yoke, declared himself a god and found thousands to believe him.

But the cult of living heroes and persons in authority was not firmly established until after the time of Alexander the Great, whose personality, subjected to oriental influences, practically obliterated the distinction between gods and men, in the princely houses which shared his inheritance. In Egypt, where, as in Persia, it had long been held that the king was a god or at least the son of a god, Ptolemy Philadelphus first introduced the cult of the living ruler for state reasons ; in the Seleucid empire it was of prime importance, whereas the Attalidae appear to have formally abandoned it.

After the Romans began to interfere with the oriental elements in the cities of Asia Minor, the cult of the goddess Roma, to whom the inhabitants of Smyrna had erected a temple as early as 195 B.C., made its appearance side by side with the cult of the ruling prince, which attained its highest development in the kingdoms of the Diadochi. With this cult of Roma were associated the divine honours bestowed upon Roman governors and generals, such as Titus Quintius Flamininus, 'the liberator of Greece', in whose time they appeared a perfectly natural expression of enthusiastic gratitude. In the last days of the republic the dedication of temples (probably in common with the goddess Roma or other divinities) had become quite a usual manner of showing homage for Roman proconsuls.

Consequently, if the Romans had been for a long time accustomed to regard apotheosis as no excessive honour even for the living, the claim of the new monarchs to it appeared a matter of course ; and if the deification of the living was kept within certain limits, this was due to the self-restraint of the ruler, not to any want of deference on the part of his subjects. What could have been more in conformity with the belief in divine natures in human form than to regard the all-powerful rulers of the universe, 'the vicegerents of the gods upon earth', so immeasurably exalted above so many millions, as 'present and corporeal gods', and their death as an elevation to that higher world to which they

belonged ? If the apotheosis of the emperors was as a rule a work of the conscious hypocrisy of servility, it at least corresponded in certain cases to the popular belief. The 'translation' of Caesar to the gods, says Suetonius, was not only the result of a decree of the Senate, but in accordance with the belief of the multitude ; a comet, which was visible for the next seven days, was supposed to be his soul taken up into heaven. After the death of Marcus Aurelius, all orders and classes of the people, irrespective of sex or age, paid him divine honours ; any one who did not keep his image in his house was considered impious, and even in Diocletian's time his statue frequently occupied a place between the Penates ; many prophecies, confirmed by the event, were believed to have been delivered by him in visions. Thus there can be no doubt that this good and gentle and universally beloved monarch was really regarded as a god by the people. In the domestic chapel of Alexander Severus, where a religious service was held every morning, not only the souls of the holy (including Apollonius of Tyana, Orpheus, Abraham and Christ), but also the best of the deified emperors, were worshipped.

It is easy to understand, however, that this belief in a real deification of men was repugnant even to those who in other respects were staunchly orthodox. Pausanias says that in his time men were no longer changed into gods, as formerly Heracles, the Dioscuri, Amphiaraus, except in words, and in order to flatter power. He probably had in mind the apotheosis of Antinous, for which, however, an oriental model was not wanting. Thus, at Alexandria, Belesticha, 'a foreign woman of the town', received the honours of divinity and a temple as 'Aphrodite Belesticha' from her royal lover (Ptolemy II Philadelphus). No doubt, generally speaking, the cult of Antinous was observed 'in order to flatter power' ; but the belief of the next generation in the divinity of the beautiful, melancholy looking youth was sincere (as appears from Athenagoras, *c.* 177), and lasted at least till the third century. Celsus had compared the worship of Christ with that of Antinous, and Origen, who rejects this comparison as entirely inadmissible, had no doubt that in reality a demon under the name of Antinous haunted his temple. 'If one were to investigate, in a spirit of truth and impartiality, the

stories relating to Antinous, he would find that it was due to the magical arts and rites of the Egyptians that there was even the appearance of his performing anything in the city which bears his name, and that, too, only after his decease—an effect which is said to have been produced in other temples by the Egyptians and those who are skilled in the arts which they practise. For they set up in certain places demons claiming prophetic or healing power, which frequently torture those who seem to have committed any mistake about ordinary kinds of food or other religious precepts. Of this nature is the being that is considered to be a god in Antinoöpolis in Egypt, whose virtues are the lying inventions of some who live by the gain derived therefrom ; while others, deceived by the demon placed there, and others again convicted of a weak conscience, actually think that they are paying a divine penalty inflicted by Antinous. Of such a nature also are the mysteries which they perform and the seeming predictions which they utter. Far different from such are those of Jesus.' [1]

Further, the cult of the emperors was on the whole nothing more than the expression of absolute devotion, which the despot could demand from his subjects, at least so far as the recognition of a divine nature in a human personality was in no way repugnant to religious belief. If Christians have never committed the folly of worshipping a king as a god, the reason is not that the difference between ruler and ruled was less, the feeling of self-respect greater, or servility less resourceful in inventing degrading acts of homage (rather, the contrary was the case in the Byzantine empire and in France under Louis XIV and Napoleon I). Christian dogma forbade such an act of folly, which pagan belief encouraged, and only allowed the ruler to be recognized as the representative of God upon earth. The Roman imperial cult was a form, the essentially political importance of which no thinking man could mistake, while its external accomplishment left religious life properly so-called untouched, and was quite incapable of shaking belief. To the believer, that which is sacred does not cease to be so because he has seen it misused or desecrated in individual cases ; rather, like Pausanias,

[1] Origen, *Contra Celsum*, iii. 36, Eng. trans. by F. Crombie in Clark's *Ante-Nicen Christian Library*, xxiii. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.)

he promptly holds up the abuse to ridicule and contempt, only to cling the more firmly to what is venerable and precious in his belief.

The best proof, however, of the strength and vitality of polytheism is the fact that it was able to hold its ground for centuries against Christianity, and further, in a certain sense to compel Christians to recognize its truth. For it never occurred to Christians in general to deny the real existence of the pagan gods; they did not even dispute their superhuman attributes nor the miracles performed by them. Of course, it was only natural that they should look upon them as powers of darkness, demons, fallen or lost angels and their descendants, or sinful souls, permitted by God to injure and lead men astray. Consequently, even those who carried on the war of extermination against polytheism were so inextricably mixed up with it that they could not bring themselves to deny its reality. The authority of this belief must have been general and most firmly established in men's conscience, if its most irreconcilable opponents were unable to withdraw themselves completely from its influence.

But, seeing that so many direct and incontestable proofs of the universality and strength of polytheism are ready to hand, all such indirect evidence may be dispensed with. The stronger a belief is, and the more deeply it is rooted in the conscience, the more eagerly does it seek and the more certainly does it find throughout nature and life confirmation of the existence and action of the powers believed in; it recognizes the hand of the divinity where unbelief sees only chance or natural effects of natural causes. Its most passionate demand is for facts and phenomena, which demonstrate beyond doubt the divine power to overrule the laws of nature, and this demand of necessity always secures its own satisfaction; the miracle is the favourite child of faith. Now, if the belief in miracles is an infallible test of the intensity of belief in the higher power, which is assumed to be the author of the miracle, there can be no doubt that, in the first centuries of the Christian era, a belief in the gods of tradition and cult, entirely positive and unaffected by scepticism, was common in all strata of society. The strength of this belief varied, being of course strongest in least educated circles.

The old belief in anthropomorphism, powerfully supported

by the impression produced by the everywhere present and life-like images of the gods, made it possible for the believer to recognize the corporeal presence of the god himself in the author of a miracle performed before his eyes ; and the fact that such was the case at the time of which we are speaking is established beyond all doubt by the well-known incident of the apostles at Lystra. How certain must these men have been of the existence and close proximity of their gods, who saw in the author of the miraculous cure of the lame man and in his companion, not messengers from heaven but very gods, and were at once filled with the conviction that the gods had come down to them in the likeness of men. 'And they called Barnabas, Jupiter ; and Paul, Mercurius, because he was the chief speaker. Then the priest of Jupiter, which was before their city, brought oxen and garlands unto the gates, and would have done sacrifice with the people'. And the apostles 'scarce restrained the people, that they had not done sacrifice unto them'. Here then was a faith still living, as firm as a rock and as childlike as that of the ancient Athenians who, imagining the beautiful woman clothed in complete armour, by whom Pisistratus was accompanied on his return, to be Athene in person, worshipped her as a goddess ; Herodotus cannot find words to express his amazement at such unheard of simplicity. A parallel is to be found in the faith which in our own days makes the Italian peasant recognize the mother of God herself in a young, beautiful and madonna-like benefactress.

It may be admitted that belief was perhaps blindest and the propensity to self-deception most common in the heart of anterior Asia, as is expressly attested by Lucian in the case of Paphlagonia. Undoubtedly superstitious beliefs and prejudices were always stronger in the East than in the West. But if the believer was only rarely convinced of the actual presence of the divinity, he saw everywhere the wonders worked by him, his enthusiasm was continually re-kindled, and even sceptics were carried away by the sincere and universal belief in miracles. The miracles wrought in the year 71 at Alexandria, 'indicating the favour of heaven and an undoubted affection of the gods for Vespasian' are described by Tacitus and other historians in perfect good faith. A blind man and a paralytic, having been inspired by Serapis

in a dream, implored Vespasian to touch them and so restore the use of their limbs. Vespasian finally decided to do as they asked publicly before the people. 'The hand immediately resumed its functions, and the light of day again shone upon the blind man. These two facts are attested by eye-witnesses at the present day, when there is no longer any advantage to be gained by falsehood'. Vespasian afterwards went unattended to the temple of Serapis to learn what the future had in store for him. There he saw a man named Basilides, although it was subsequently ascertained that he was many miles away at that moment. Vespasian recognized in his name an omen of his impending greatness. No one who believed these miracles could doubt the power and greatness of the god, to whom they were attributed by the voice of the people.

This miracle belongs to a period when the idea of appealing to miracles as great and convincing as the Christian certainly cannot be attributed to the heathen. But when the struggle of the two religions for the empire of humanity had begun, the mania for miracles necessarily became greater on both sides the longer the conflict lasted and the more furious it became. We may assume that, about the end of the second century, the need was already felt of setting up a rival to the founder of Christianity in the person of a prophet of the old gods, equally superhuman and equally capable of working miracles. This was probably the purpose of Philostratus' romance of Apollonius of Tyana, composed at the command of the empress Julia Domna. The birth of Apollonius is as marvellous as his end and his reappearance on earth, to convince a young man who disbelieved in immortality. Among the miracles performed by him are the casting out of demons and the raising of a man from the dead. His knowledge of the future and of hidden secrets borders on omniscience. The emperor Alexander Severus (as already observed) worshipped him in his domestic chapel together with Christ. The anti-Christian neo-Platonist Hierocles (under Diocletian) put him above Christ, whose acts he declared had been embellished by the fictions of the apostles, whereas those of Apollonius were attested by unimpeachable witnesses. Apollonius' reputation was great, not only among pagans, but also among Christians of the succeeding centuries.

In a Christian collection of 'oracular responses of Hellenic gods', composed about 474–91, it is declared that only Moses, Hermes Trismegistus and Apollonius were like God. The pious Jansenist Tillemont (died 1698) believed that the devil, fearing the destruction of his kingdom, had caused Apollonius to be born about the same time as Jesus; Bayle in his lexicon (1741) calls him 'the ape of the son of God'.

Not only did heathens and Christians meet miracles with miracles, but they must frequently have laid claim to the same miracle, although only one instance is reported. During the war against the Quadi (173–4) in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, the Roman army, overcome by the heat of the blazing sun, found itself surrounded by a superior force, and threatened with annihilation. Then suddenly thick clouds gathered together, rain fell in torrents, and a fearful storm wrought havoc and confusion in the ranks of the enemy; the Romans were saved and gained the victory. The effect of this event was overwhelming; according to the custom of the time it was immortalized by pictorial representation, was generally regarded as a miracle, the memory of which lasted till the last days of antiquity, and for centuries afterwards was appealed to by both Christians and pagans as a proof of the truth of their respective faiths. A picture, which Themistius had seen, represented the emperor himself appealing to Jupiter for aid with uplifted hands, while the soldiers caught the rain in their helmets; the scene on the column of Marcus Aurelius, which has hitherto been generally regarded as a representation of this event, cannot possibly be meant. The marvellous deliverance of the army appears to have been generally attributed to the emperor's prayer to Jupiter; others, however, asserted that it was really due to the art of an Egyptian magician Arnuphis, a member of his suite, who had drawn down rain from heaven by calling upon the gods, especially Hermes. But according to the account of a Christian contemporary, the miracle had been wrought by the prayers of the Christian soldiers of the twelfth legion. Tertullian also (197) refers to the Christian version as well known, and appeals to a letter of Marcus Aurelius in support of it.

Amongst the miracles, which the Platonist Celsus in his work against Christianity adduces as a proof of the existence

of the gods, he gives special prominence to oracles, prognostics and portents, by which they announced the future or issued warnings and exhortations, and which convinced the faithful not only of the existence of the gods, but also of their solicitude for mankind. 'What need is there to collect all the oracular responses, which have been delivered with a divine voice by priests and priestesses, as well as by others, whether men or women, who were under a divine influence? all the wonderful things that have been heard issuing from the inner sanctuary? all the revelations that have been made to those who consulted the sacrificial victims? and all the knowledge that has been conveyed to men by other signs and prodigies? To some the gods have appeared in visible forms. The world is full of such instances. How many cities have been built in obedience to commands received from oracles: how often, in the same way, delivered from disease and famine! Or again, how many cities, from disregard or forgetfulness of these oracles, have perished miserably! How many colonies have been established and made to flourish by following their orders! How many princes and private persons have, from this cause, had prosperity or adversity! How many, who mourned over their childlessness, have obtained the blessing they asked for! How many have turned away from themselves the anger of demons! How many, who were maimed in their limbs, have had them restored! And again, how many have met with summary punishment for showing want of reverence to the temples—some being instantly seized with madness, others openly confessing their crimes, others having put an end to their lives, and others having become the victims of incurable maladies! Yea, some have been slain by a terrible voice issuing from the inner sanctuary' (Origen, *Contra Celsum*, viii. 45, Crombie's trans. Edinburgh: T, & T. Clark.)

The belief in wonderful signs and announcements of the future, of which at that time 'the whole world was full', to all appearance was the most general form of belief in miracles, at least in the last days of antiquity. Many philosophers and others who had received a philosophical education also professed it. Certainly it was rejected by Epicureans, Cynics and Aristotelians and controverted by Academicians; but Platonists, Pythagoreans and Stoics only clung to it the more firmly, and this belief formed part and parcel of the theology

of the last-named in particular. 'The belief in an extraordinary care of God for individual man was too comforting an idea for them to renounce; they not only appealed to divination as the strongest proof of the existence of gods and the government of providence, but they also drew the converse conclusion, that, if there be gods, there must also be divination, since the benevolence of the gods would not allow them to refuse to mankind so inestimable a gift' (Zeller, *Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics*, Eng. trans., p. 372). This belief then, which in fact necessarily presupposed a belief in the gods and providence, with which it stood or fell, was extremely common amongst the educated at that time.

It is true that Livy declares that prodigies were neither publicly made known nor recorded in historical works owing to the indifference which caused the general disbelief of his time in marvellous presages sent by the gods. But this indifference cannot have lasted long, for all the historians of the imperial period without exception record such wonders; in time prodigies even became an object of special interest to believers, which explains the origin of the collection of all the signs and wonders observed in Italy, compiled from Livy by a certain Julius Obsequens (of uncertain date).

Tacitus, who maintained a critical attitude towards the belief in signs and wonders, and expressly guarded against the common superstition, which saw an omen in every uncommon event, undoubtedly did not recognize the genuineness of a number of reputed prodigies; nevertheless, he did not doubt that they did occur, and in the later books of his great history of his time he has recorded all those subsequent to the year 51. Consequently, it seems that in his case the belief in such things, although probably always entertained by him, had increased with years. In the second book of the *Histories* (ch. 50), he relates that, on the day of the battle of Bedriacum, a bird, the like of which had never been seen, alighted on the ground near Regium Lepidum, and, undaunted by the throng of men and other birds that circled round it, would not move until Otho had killed himself; then it disappeared. When men came to calculate the time, it was found that the beginning and end of the prodigy exactly coincided with Otho's death. Tacitus expressly adds that, although he considered it beneath his dignity to embellish a serious work with fables, he could not in

this instance refuse to believe what was universally reported.

The regular mention, in Suetonius, Cassius Dio, Herodian and the later imperial biographers, of presages, especially those which announced to a private individual his future accession to the throne, or the death of the emperor, leaves no doubt as to the persistence of this belief, with which the writers must certainly have credited the majority of their readers; and the narrative frequently shows to what extent it was held by the most prominent men of the time. Augustus, says Suetonius, paid great attention to certain omens, as to the meaning of which he had no doubt. If he put a shoe on the wrong foot, it was a bad sign; if dew fell when he was starting on a long journey, it was a good sign. Wonderful events also always made a great impression on him; as, for instance, when a palm tree sprouted from the cracks between the stones in front of his house, and on his arrival at Capri the drooping branches of an old holm-oak revived. Had Livy read in Suetonius the list (culled by him from books and traditions with all the industry of a bee) of all the omens which announced the future greatness of Augustus, his victories and his death, perhaps he would have recalled his complaint of the indifference of his contemporaries to such things. To a faith as robust as this, every event was full of significance; no marvel was too great or too ridiculous for it. Suetonius seriously relates that Augustus, when a child just beginning to speak, once ordered some frogs on a family estate to cease croaking, which, it was asserted, they immediately did.

Of course different kinds of portents were differently appreciated by believers, and the various methods of divination did not always enjoy the same esteem, but sometimes one, sometimes another, found the greatest favour. But not one of the recognized kinds of divination ever fell entirely into disuse for want of belief. Cicero's crushing ridicule of the art of the *haruspex* [1] and the inspection of entrails might suggest the mistaken view, that this method of divination was too deeply discredited ever to recover its popularity, whereas nothing could be further from the truth. Cicero quotes Cato's remark, that he wondered how one *haruspex* could look at another without laughing, and Hannibal's question to King

[1] The *haruspex* foretold the future from the inspection of the entrails of sacrificial victims.

Prusias (who refused to give battle 'because the entrails forbade it'), whether he had more faith in a slice of veal than in an old general; he further recalls the fact that in the last civil war the exact opposite of what had been foretold nearly always happened. But the mockery of unbelievers no more disturbed the faith of believers than the facts which gave the lie to their belief. As always happens in such cases, they only remembered prophecies, which were, or were supposed to have been, fulfilled; and ample testimony from succeeding centuries confirms the persistence of the belief in the inspection of entrails, and its diffusion even amongst the educated classes.

The fact that Tiberius prohibited the consultation of *haruspices* in secret and without the presence of witnesses assumes a very general use of this form of divination. Claudius' apprehension (in 47) that the oldest science in Italy might become extinct through neglect, can only have referred to the decay of the Etruscan *haruspicina*, not to a general diminution of its employment. The older Pliny also says expressly that large numbers of people firmly believe that animals warn us of danger by their muscular fibres and entrails. On the morning of the day on which the emperor Galba was murdered (January 15, 69), the *haruspex* Umbricius informed him that the entrails of the victim pointed to a dangerous plot and an enemy in the house; Otho, who was standing by, took this as an omen favourable to his undertaking. Epictetus, who in accordance with the doctrines of his school recognized divine revelations and thoroughly believed in the art which interpreted them, only advises that man should be influenced in his actions not only by divination, but before all by a sense of duty. There would have been no occasion for this advice, had not divination been very generally recognized. It is only fear of the future, he says, that so often drives men to the soothsayers. Trembling with excitement, they approach them with prayers and flattery, as if they could fulfil our wishes: 'Lord, shall I be my father's heir? Lord, have pity on me, restore me to health! But the *augur* or *haruspex* can only foresee impending events, death, danger, sickness or the like. He does not know whether they are really beneficial or injurious to the person concerned'. Herodian says that the brave resistance offered by the city of Aquileia to Maximin was mainly due to the prophecies of its *haruspices:*

' for the inhabitants of Italy have most confidence in this kind of divination '. The estimation in which it was held outside Italy also is shown not only by the remarks of Epictetus, but also by the recognition accorded it by the dream-interpreter Artemidorus, who admitted only a few methods of divination besides his own : astrology, the inspection of victims' liver (i.e. entrails), and the flight of birds. Further, accidental statements of different dates allow us to conclude that the art of the *haruspex* never lacked supporters amongst the educated. Regulus, notorious during the period from Nero to Domitian as an orator and accuser in cases of *lèse-majesté*, was accustomed in every case to question the *haruspices* as to the result of the trial. According to Juvenal, they had to answer so many questions about the favourite musical *virtuosi* and actors of distinguished women, that they got varicose veins from standing so long on their feet. The emperor Gordian I was greatly skilled in this art, in which Diocletian also had great confidence. Constantine allowed it to be practised in public, but forbade it inside the house on pain of death ; in cases of injury by lightning he ordered it himself (321) for state reasons. According to Ammianus Marcellinus, one of the means for reading the future which providence has bestowed upon mankind is the inspection of entrails ; he says that Julian, while still a professing Christian, was devoted to the art of the *haruspex* and the *augur*, ' and everything else practised by the worshippers of the gods from time immemorial '. Such incidental proofs of the lasting and widespread belief in the art of the *haruspex*, which could be multiplied, justify us in assuming the same in the case of all the other traditional methods of divination.

Among the methods of inquiring into the future, astrology, the favourite science of that age, which enjoyed the highest favour, especially amongst the upper classes, did not necessarily presuppose belief in the gods and a providence exercised by them, although, on the other hand, it by no means excluded it. Of the older members of the Stoic school, which believed in Providence, Panaetius was the only one who rejected it ; he contested the efficacy of prognostics and divination in general. Yet it was only natural that the widespread belief in an inevitable fate, which more than anything else encouraged astrology, should tend to the abandonment of polytheism.

The belief ' which referred all events to their constellations by the laws of nativity ', equally approved of by the educated and ignorant and shared by Seneca, according to which what had been once decided was irrevocably fixed for all time, definitively superannuated the divinity. According to Suetonius, Tiberius showed little interest in the gods and their cult, because he was entirely devoted to astrology, and thoroughly convinced that everything happened in accordance with the decrees of fate.

But oracular predictions also, in which the gods, as it were, in person revealed the future to mankind, since they assumed the direct inspiration of the divinity, were bound more than anything else to strengthen and foster the belief in the latter. In the first centuries of the Christian era these predictions enjoyed a reputation almost as great as in any earlier period ; and the fact that they not only held their ground, but, after a temporary decline, underwent a complete restoration, is a still more indubitable proof of the strength of polytheism. Strabo, who expressly attests the decay and neglect of the Greek oracles in the time of Augustus, was certainly influenced in his statements by the recollection of the splendour of Delphi, which had been extinct for centuries. None the less, to all appearance he gives the correct explanation of the phenomenon—that the Romans were satisfied with the predictions of the Sibylline books and the Etruscan methods of divination (observation of the entrails, the flight of birds, and the heavenly signs). It was a natural result of universal empire, that the non-Roman should everywhere be kept down by the Roman element ; and it was just at that time that the overpowering impression of Roman might and greatness had reached its height in the Greek world. But although this impression was strong enough to divert man's religious needs into new channels, it was by no means strong enough to control them permanently. The old belief was completely restored ; the famous oracular temples were again filled with pilgrims. There ' prophets, full of the god and identified with him, foretold the future, warded off dangers, healed the sick, comforted the sorrowful, helped the unhappy, gave consolation in suffering and relief in distress '. Christian writers declare that with the coming of the Redeemer into the world the power of the false gods had been broken, that the charm by means of

which they had so long given speech to images of wood and stone had lost its power, and that their oracles were dumb, but even they were obliged to confess that the demons in the temples again issued true prophecies and salutary warnings and performed cures. Their object, of course, was to do all the more injury to those whom they turned aside from the search after the true God, by insinuating into their minds ideas of the false one. The foreknowledge of the future possessed by the demons was explained by their being former servants of God who were thus acquainted with his intentions. Even Petrarch, in other respects remarkably free from superstition, believed in the heathen oracles as given by demons.

The greatness of the Roman empire and the incessant mutual intercourse of all its component parts, highly developed by its admirable means of communication, enormously enlarged the area over which the influence of the more respected oracles extended. Pilgrims journeyed from remote barbarian lands to the Greek temples in search of help and counsel, and the responses of the Greek gods were received with awe in countries to which their names had never penetrated before Rome ruled the world. Apparently in the time of Hadrian, a cohort of Tungri in its fixed quarters at Borcovicus (Housesteads in Northumberland) in Britain offered an *ex-voto* ' to the gods and goddesses in accordance with the interpretation of the oracle of Apollo of Claros ' (near Colophon), and similarly dedicated inscriptions at Obrovazzo in the north of Dalmatia and at Cuicul in Numidia refer to the response of the same oracle ; in these cases we may perhaps assume a joint consultation of this god by troops of different provinces. Anyhow, there can be no doubt that the most famous oracles in all the provinces were consulted in imperial times, a fact confirmed by numerous incidental statements in ancient authorities. To mention only a few instances, Germanicus consulted the oracle of the bull Apis at Memphis in addition to that of Apollo at Claros, Tiberius the ' lot ' oracle of Geryones near Patavium, Caligula that of ' the Fortunes ' at Antium, Nero that of Delphi, Vespasian that of mount Carmel, Titus that of Venus at Paphos in Cyprus, Caracalla that of Serapis at Alexandria and all the other oracles of repute. Amongst believers, proofs of the omniscience of the oracles were brought forward, stronger even than the answers of the Delphian oracle to the

inquiries of Croesus, as recorded by Herodotus. Plutarch's friend, the learned Demetrius of Tarsus, gives an account of an event of which he was an eye-witness—the conversion of an unbelieving governor of Cilicia by an oracular response. At the suggestion of certain Epicurean scoffers at religion in his suite, he sent a freedman with a sealed tablet, containing the question to which he desired an answer, to the dream-oracle of the demi-god Mopsus. The messenger, who according to custom spent a night in the temple, dreamed that a handsome man approached him and said 'a black one', and then retired. When he informed the governor, he was terrified, fell on his knees, opened the tablet, and showed the question to those who were present: 'Shall I sacrifice a black or a white bull?' Even the Epicureans were disconcerted; the governor offered the sacrifice, and ever afterwards worshipped Mopsus.

Nothing, however, so clearly shows the extent to which the believer in miracles was capable of self-deception, and how readily oracles found admission and acceptance in countries where they had been previously unknown, as Lucian's account of the pretended oracle of Apollo and Aesculapius set up by the false prophet Alexander in his native town of Abonuteichos in Paphlagonia.

Alexander (*c.* 105–*c.* 175), who when a boy was remarkable for his beauty, had been instructed in the art of magic by a physician (a countryman of Apollonius of Tyana), to whom he acted as assistant. Having travelled with a single companion through Bithynia and Macedonia in the character of a magician and soothsayer, he decided to found an oracle of his own in his native place, which appeared specially adapted for the purpose, owing to the wealth and crass superstition of its inhabitants. Tablets of bronze, buried by Alexander in the temple of Apollo at Chalcedon and conveniently discovered again, announced that Apollo and his son Asclepius were coming to Abonuteichos. The inhabitants, highly delighted, at once set about building a temple to Asclepius. After a Sibylline oracle had been circulated to the effect that Alexander, a descendant of Perseus and Asclepius, would make his appearance as a prophet, he entered the town, an imposing and attractive personality, magnificently clad in a white and purple tunic, carrying a sickle in his hand after the manner of Perseus. The god Asclepius was said to have revealed him-

self in the form of a snake. Prompted by Alexander, hi fellow townsmen found an empty goose's egg, containing little snake, in a pool of water which had collected where th foundations of the temple had been dug. Soon afterward he exhibited a large tame snake which had long been kept i readiness, the rapid growth of the god being looked upon a a matter of course. Appearing with the snake round his nec in a dimly-lighted room, he thrust out from his robe a snake' head made of painted linen, somewhat resembling a huma face, the mouth of which could be opened or shut by mean of a horsehair attachment inside. Subsequently pipes (a number of cranes' windpipes fastened together) were fixe in the head, through which an assistant could make the go speak; but these 'autophonic'[1] oracles were only give exceptionally and for a high fee. As a rule questions wer handed in sealed and given back in the same condition; whe opened, the answer of the god was found written inside. Th name of the god was Glycon.

The fame of the oracle spread rapidly throughout Asia Mino and Thrace, and during the whole time of its existence (mor than twenty years) it was visited by such crowds, that foo ran short at Abonuteichos. Lucian estimates the annua income of the prophet at about £3,000 (the fee for the oracl being about 1s.), out of which he had to pay a number o assistants of all kinds; on the other hand, two interpreters o obscure oracular utterances had each to pay him £240 yearly out of their takings. The god frequently promised that the wishes of those who consulted him would be fulfilled, if the prophet interceded for them. It was no uncommon thing for questions to be asked in foreign languages, such as Syrian and Celtic (the language in general use in Galatia), and it was not always easy to find persons who understood them. Occasional blunders in the answers did not injure the prestige of the oracle; it was dangerous to deny its divine nature, for Alexander knew how to rouse the crowd of believers to frenzy against its enemies (especially the Epicureans) with the cry of 'atheists and Christians'. He gained the friendship of the priests of the most famous oracles of Asia Minor by sending on his own visitors to them.

[1] I.e. oracles delivered by the god himself. The word 'autophonic' does not seem to be in use in English, but is adopted for brevity (the Greek is αὐτόφωνος).

Alexander also sent emissaries into other provinces to spread the worship of his god, and soon found numerous adherents in Italy and Rome itself. Many of the most highly placed and influential personages put themselves into communication with him. Insidious questions (i.e. such as referred to the emperor or affairs of state) were kept back by Alexander; he thus had the questioners in his power, and they were obliged to pay a high price for his silence. The god-fearing and superstitious Publius Mummius Sisenna Rutilianus (*consul suffectus* about 157) believed in him so blindly, that at the command of the god Glycon, when sixty years of age, he married Alexander's daughter, whose mother was supposed to be the moon-goddess. It was Rutilianus who persuaded the emperor Marcus Aurelius to have two lions thrown into the Danube as an offering certain to ensure victory; the result was that the Romans suffered a severe defeat (under Furius Victorinus, 167–9). When Lucian wanted to prosecute Alexander for an attempt upon his life, and lodged a complaint before Lollianus Avitus, the governor of Bithynia, the latter besought him to abandon the idea, since he could not prosecute the father-in-law of Rutilianus. At that time the terrors of war, combined with the ravages of a widespread epidemic, everywhere increased the need of religion and strengthened belief. On the door of every house an oracular response could be read, supposed to be a certain preventive of the disease, and circulated by Alexander's messengers, who had recommended his assistance against pestilence, fires and earthquakes.

When Alexander died at the age of seventy, his honour, wealth and influence were still undiminished; even after his death, it was believed that his statue in the market-place of Parium in Mysia delivered oracles. Lucian's account, which might be considered exaggerated, is fully confirmed by coins of Abonuteichos with the heads of the emperors Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius, exhibiting on the reverse a snake with a human head, some of them inscribed Glycon. The legends of these coins further confirm the statement of Lucian that Alexander persuaded Lucius Verus during his stay in Asia (163–6), to change the name of his native place to 'Ionopolis', which entirely supplanted Abonuteichos and is still preserved in the slightly altered form Inebolu. The above type of coin occurs there till the time of Gallus Tre-

bonianus (251–3), and under Caracalla and Gordian III also in Nicomedia, whither the cult of Glycon must likewise have penetrated. Further evidences of its extension have been found in Dacia (chiefly colonized from Asia Minor), and upper Moesia; perhaps also in Africa. Two inscriptions that have come to light in Dacia (at Carlsburg in Transylvania) are dedicated to the god Glycon, ' by his command ', one in Moesia (at Uskub in Turkish Macedonia) ' to Jupiter and Juno, to the serpent and the serpent's wife and Alexander ', according to which Alexander appears to have had a female counterpart, in addition to the snake mentioned by Lucian.

The fact that so gross an imposture could be practised so long with such enormous success and without serious opposition, naturally implies an even stronger belief in the recognized oracles, and enables us to estimate their influence. Several of these were dream-oracles, as those of Mopsus and Amphilochus at Mallus in Cilicia, which announced to Sextus Quintilius Condianus his own and his brother's murder by Commodus in a dream (of Hercules, as a child, strangling the two serpents). But the belief that dreams predicted the future, not only in these sanctuaries but everywhere, was the most general of all forms of belief in portents, which was not even contested by some of those who in other respects utterly refused to believe in prophecy. Aristotle and Democritus admitted the occurrence of prophetic dreams, not, however, as sent by the gods, but as the natural effects of natural causes; the elder Pliny, also, who denied all supernatural revelation of the future, was inclined to the belief in significant dreams. In one of his earlier books he leaves the question undecided, but in a later one he states as an undoubted fact that one of the imperial guard in Rome, who had been attacked by hydrophobia as the result of the bite of a mad dog, was saved by a remedy revealed in a dream to his mother in Spain. Having no idea of his misfortune, she had communicated the purport of the dream to him in a letter, which reached him just in time to save him, when his life was despaired of. When Pliny says that this hitherto unknown remedy, which always proved successful in other cases, had been revealed by ' God ', he is referring to the mysterious working of nature, also manifested in the sympathies and antipathies of its forces, certainly not to the providence of a personal divinity.

Now, although the belief in prophetic dreams does not necessarily suppose the belief in the gods and Providence, it may safely be asserted that the one was rarely unaccompanied by the other; in the majority of cases belief and unbelief were accorded simultaneously to both. To all appearance the theory of Democritus found little favour even amongst the Epicureans, who, generally speaking, not only denied the working of Providence, but also divination, whether by dreams or in any other form. On the other hand, says Origen, all who accepted the doctrine of Providence regarded it as certain that manifestations and phenomena were brought before men's minds in dreams, some of which were of a nature entirely divine, while others revealed the future, sometimes clearly, sometimes in riddles. In sleep, says the spokesman of heathenism in the dialogue of Minucius Felix, we see, hear and recognize the divinity, whom by day we impiously deny, treat with contempt, and insult by perjury. The Stoics, especially, attached the greatest value to this ' special form of consolation derived from a natural oracle ', bestowed by Providence upon mankind; even Christians believed that dreams that came true were sent not only by God, but also by demons, certainly with the evil intention mentioned above, and with the reservation that those sent by the latter were more frequently deceptive and impure. We shall not be far wrong, then, if we infer a universal and firm belief in the gods and Providence from the universal and firm belief in dreams.

The most superficial acquaintance with the literature (especially historical) of the first centuries of the Christian era is sufficient to establish beyond a doubt the universality of the belief in dreams. An important event is rarely described, without *one* dream at least being mentioned in which it was predicted. The most eminent men were greatly influenced in their actions by dreams, and prompted to all kinds of undertakings; it was in consequence of a dream that Galen wrote his treatises on mathematics, and Pliny the elder his history of the Roman wars in Germany. Dreams often determined the choice of a man's career; thus, Galen's father, in consequence of a dream, decided to educate him for the medical profession. Galen himself was frequently guided by dreams in the treatment of his patients, as a rule with the happiest results. Thus, on one occasion, acting on the inspiration of

two unmistakably clear dreams, he made an incision in the veins between the index and middle finger of the right hand, and let the blood flow till it stopped of itself. His belief in the art of divination by the flight of birds was equally strong. Suetonius begged the younger Pliny to procure the adjournment of a case in which he was defendant, since a dream had foretold that the verdict would be against him. Pliny advised him to think over the matter again, since the question was whether Suetonius' dreams signified impending events or the contrary, as in the case of a dream of his own.

Augustus, who paid careful attention not only to his own dreams, but to those of others which had reference to him, was persuaded by a dream to take his stand once every year on a certain day in a certain place, to hold out his hand like a beggar to passers-by, and to accept the copper coins offered to him. Marcus Aurelius offered thanks to the gods for having communicated to him in a dream a prescription for dizziness and blood-spitting. Cassius Dio wrote a book on the dreams and prognostics which foretold the accession of Septimius Severus; the latter, who attached such importance to his dreams that he had one of them represented in bronze, accepted it very graciously. In one of these dreams, he saw himself conducted to a lofty watch-tower, from which he had an extensive view over land and sea; he moved his hands as if he were playing the lute, and harmonious sounds reached his ear. Dio also began his great Roman history 'at the command of the divinity in a dream', and found courage and strength to continue and complete it in fresh dreams, in which Tychē (Fortune), to whom he had devoted himself as the tutelary deity of his life, promised him immortality.

The only dream-book that has survived out of a very extensive, chiefly Greek, literature of the subject, is especially interesting as a proof how generally the interpretation of dreams was recognized as a science, whose representatives endeavoured to develop as rigorous and exact a method of interpretation as possible, based upon the most comprehensive and trustworthy material available. The author of this treatise, Artemidorus of Daldis (as he preferred to call himself rather than from his native city Ephesus, in order that his mother's obscure birthplace might have the glory of having produced a famous man), lived towards the end of the second

century. He wrote in obedience to the repeated command of Apollo, who had appeared to him in a dream in visible form, and at the instigation of Cassius Maximus, a man of senatorial rank and African descent, who was also on friendly terms with Aristides. Artemidorus, who also wrote on the observation of birds and palmistry, regarded the dreams which the gods 'send to the naturally prophetic soul of man' as a practical proof of divine Providence. His chief opponents he considered to be those who believed neither in Providence nor in any kind of divination. His profound respect for the action of the divinity is shown by the warning that, when a man begs the gods to send him dreams, he should neither inquire after what is useless nor pray as if he were addressing instructions to them, and after the dream he should offer a sacrifice and a prayer of thanksgiving. He regarded his mission of interpreting the manifestations of the divinity as a priestly office, and his 'science' as sacred. To its investigation he had devoted his whole life, studied night and day, bought all the dream-books he could find, and during his journeys in Asia Minor, Greece, Italy, and the islands had made the acquaintance of as many professional *confrères* as possible, and had endeavoured to increase his knowledge by experience. His lofty idea of the truth and dignity of his science caused him to disdain all quackery and artifice. He had never endeavoured to produce an effect upon the general public or to win the approval of professional rhetoricians; otherwise it would have been as easy for him as for others to use dazzling and striking language. He always insists upon simple and intelligible explanations of dreams, and rejects all the subtleties and artificialities which impress the vulgar; he even considers them blasphemous, since to a certain extent the intention to deceive is thereby attributed to the gods who send the dreams. The only thing he was proud of was the rigorous accuracy of his interpretation. His book contains numerous proofs of his sincerity and veracity; he also had the satisfaction of knowing that, although malevolent and pedantic critics might censure its incompleteness and insufficient details, no one ventured to assert that it departed from the truth even in the slightest degree. The fewer the traces of anything that can properly be called mystical or fantastical in this book, whose production and circulation is inconceivable without an educated circle

of readers of similar views, and the more consistent, rational and methodical its treatment of the subject—the more striking proof does this afford of the fact that at this period even sobriety of judgment and a certain element of rationalism by no means excluded belief in a divine Providence, which continually manifested itself in miracles.

Of these miracles the most palpable and the most convincing were the cures of diseases by means suggested in dreams; that is to say, those which faith most readily and most frequently created as continually affording it fresh support. These miracles, of course, took place by preference on the holy ground of the temples of the healing gods Aesculapius, Isis and Serapis, who also wrought other marvels in their sanctuaries. Thus Aristides declares of the inexhaustible 'sacred well' in the temple of Aesculapius at Pergamus, that by bathing in it many recovered their eyesight, and were cured of chest complaints, asthma, deformity of the feet; a dumb man who drank of its water was able to speak; and in several cases merely drawing water from the well effected a cure. It was by no means uncommon for the god to appear in person to believers. Origen complains because Celsus, who calls the Christians simple for believing in the miracles of Jesus, expects them to believe 'that a vast number of Hellenes and barbarians (according to their own assertion) have seen and still see Aesculapius, not in a vision, but in person, perform cures, distribute blessings, and predict the future'. Against these assertions Origen appeals to the innumerable witnesses to the miracles of Christ, adding that he himself had seen men delivered from grievous diseases (demoniacal possession, madness), and other evils, 'which neither men nor demons could heal', simply by calling upon the name of God and Jesus. The two semi-divine sons of Aesculapius also appeared to many at Epidaurus and other places. In a dedicatory inscription (preserved at Rome) to Pan, giving thanks for recovery from severe illness, it is said that the god appeared visibly to the patient, not in a dream, but in broad daylight.

But of course the greater marvel, the descent of the healing gods in person to those who sought their aid, was also of less frequent occurrence; as a rule cures were wrought by dreams, not limited to those who had passed the night in temples. In a special section on 'Prescriptions' Artemidorus has at-

tempted to reduce this marvel to its true proportions, by divesting it of the embellishments whereby the lively imagination of believers thought to magnify its importance, but which in his opinion were unworthy of the sublime nature of the gods. As to prescriptions, that is, treatment of maladies prescribed in a dream by the gods to men, he says that it is useless to question their efficacy. For many have been healed at Pergamus, Alexandria, and other places by prescriptions, and several believe that they are the source of medical science. But, on the other hand, absurd and ridiculous prescriptions are recorded, which have never been given in dreams, but are mere inventions. Thus, ' biting negroes ' are said to have been prescribed to a sick man in a dream (meaning peppercorns, which are black and pungent) ; to another ' maidens' milk ' and ' stars' blood ' (meaning dew). Those who imagine such things show that they do not understand the love of the gods for men. The prescriptions really given by the gods in dreams are clear and simple ; they prescribe salves and frictions, drinks and foods, called by the names we use ourselves ; if ever they clothe a prescription in ambiguous language, the riddle is always easy of solution. For instance, a woman suffering from inflammation of the breast dreamt that she was suckling a sheep ; she applied the herb called ' sheep's tongue ', and was cured. Thus, it will always be found that the cures prescribed contain absolutely nothing contradictory to rational medicine ; and consequently, that divine revelations are in perfect agreement with the certain results of science. For instance, the well-known writer Fronto, who suffered greatly from the gout, prayed the gods to tell him how he might be cured ; he dreamt that he was walking outside the city ; and as a matter of fact he obtained considerable relief by taking regular walks. Aristides was specially directed by Aesculapius, in a dream, to compose (in prose and verse) and to deliver speeches. As the god in a dream instructed a boxer, who passed the night in the temple, in the devices by which he overthrew a famous opponent, so, says Aristides, ' he has taught me knowledge and songs and subjects for speeches, and even the ideas and manner of expression, as masters teach boys their letters '. Galen mentions that Aesculapius had prescribed the writing of odes, songs and farces to many who were suffering from violent mental excitement ; others were

told to ride, hunt, and practise military exercises, definite instructions being given in what cases the remedies were to be used. The patients who had put themselves into the hands of the god at Pergamus, submitted to the severest regulations, which they would never have obeyed on the advice of a physician (e.g. to abstain from drink of any kind for a fortnight). Galen was indebted to Aesculapius for the cure of a danger us ulcer; and Marcus Aurelius, when setting out against the Marcomanni, left him behind, since the god (presumably in a dream) had pronounced against his accompanying the emperor. The custom of passing the night in the temple (ἐγκοίμησις, *incubatio*), still practised in southern Italy and Greece in cases of illness, was adopted by the Christian Church from paganism; the Madonna, the archangel Michael, and different saints and martyrs took the place of the gods and heroes who gave directions in dreams.

During the excavations in the temple of Aesculapius at Epidaurus in 1883–4 two of the six tablets have been found, on which the marvellous cures (of the sick who passed the night in his temple) accomplished by the god are recorded. These records are adapted to the rudest belief in miracles. In addition to cures of the lame, the blind and the dumb, we find the recovery of a woman after being five years pregnant with a boy, who immediately he was born washed himself and walked about with his mother. There are also numerous instances of the conversion of those who denied or doubted the god, and of the punishment of sinners, and of such as did not pay the fee. Besides these marvellous stories written by the priests, which belong to the pre-Roman period, an account given by an educated man of the second century A.D. of his restoration to health has also been found. This person, Marcus Julius Apellas, of Mylasa in Caria, who had been very ill (especially from indigestion) had been told by the god in a dream to repair to Epidaurus. On his journey, he was advised (at Aegina) not to worry so much: in the sanctuary itself he received numerous instructions as to the external and internal remedies to be used, a special diet, and the gymnastic exercises to be practised, amongst which swinging was included; although he was to bathe without the assistance of the bath-attendant, the god did not forget to add that he ought to give him a *drachma* as a tip. When he had prayed the god to cure

him more speedily, it seemed to him that he left the temple with mustard and salt rubbed all over his body, a little boy walked in front of him with a smoking censer, and the priest said, ' You are now cured, but you must pay the fee '. Later he was given a prescription of aniseed and oil for headache. But the patient had no headache. In consequence, however, of studying too hard the blood flew to his head, and he was cured by the prescribed means. ' He ordered me also to write down the remedy. Thankful and restored to health I departed '. Of four tablets found on the site of the temple of Aesculapius at Rome, two contain accounts of cures of blindness by dream-oracles, two of diseases of the breast which had been given up as incurable.

Many thanksgivings for recovery of health on Roman inscriptional stones evidently refer to prescriptions given in dreams. Near Velleia and Placentia there was a sanctuary of Minerva, who was called the ' mindful ' or the ' physician ' (of Cabardiacus), since she rendered help in sickness. Of course she was especially appealed to by the sick of the immediate neighbourhood, several of whose dedications and votive inscriptions have been preserved ; one of them is from the praefect of a cohort in Britain, probably a native of Cabardiacus. A woman thanks the goddess ' for having cured her of a grievous infirmity by a gracious gift of medicine ' ; another fulfils a vow, because her hair had grown again ; a man offers the goddess ' silver ears ', after recovery from an affection of the ear. The same goddess had a temple in Rome, the site of which (in the fifth quarter) has recently been determined by numerous representations of human limbs in clay (likewise offerings from patients who had been cured) found in a subterranean vault attached to it.

Not only the healing gods, but the gods generally, could render aid in sickness, by the sending of dreams or in other ways. Thus, according to an inscription in bad Latin, a slave of the *pontifices* at Rome brings an offering of a white cow to ' the good goddess ' (*Bona Dea*) for the recovery of his eyesight, having been cured, after he had been given up by the physicians, in ten months by the grace of the lady '. For although tradition and belief attributed to each god a special sphere of activity and benevolence, suited to his nature and character, the power of the gods was regarded

as boundless, and capable of being exercised outside its proper limits, wherever the god pleased; every god was looked upon as 'always having the power to render aid of every kind, and was applied to for assistance, where he was near, where he was beneficent, where he was worshipped'.

In all cases in which the believer recognized the action of a higher power, he most naturally and instinctively attributed it to the particular god to whom he had been in the habit of praying from early youth, whose sanctity, authority and reputation were greatest in his own city or country, and whose power he believed he had already experienced. Thus Aristides had heard many persons say that the god Asclepius had saved them during a storm at sea by stretching out his hand to them. Asclepius was the patron deity not only of all those who repaired to his temple, but of all the inhabitants of the country round about Pergamus, and of other localities famous for his cult; such was the great Diana for Ephesus, Serapis for Alexandria, Pan for Panias, Leto for the whole of Lycia, the 'heavenly goddess' of Carthage for North Africa, and so forth. Generally speaking, the god, whether of the highest or inferior rank, who was chiefly worshipped in each country, was its most natural helper in time of need. Pausanias (viii. 37, 8) speaking of a temple of Pan not far from Megalopolis in Arcadia, says: 'This Pan, equally with the most powerful of the gods, possesses the power of accomplishing men's prayers and requiting the wicked as they deserve' (Frazer's translation). At Stratonicea the divinity chiefly worshipped next to Zeus (Panameros or Panemerios) was Hecate. Both had saved the town from the greatest dangers in ancient times; hence (according to a document still extant) the town council resolved that every day thirty boys of good family, clad in white and crowned with wreaths of olive, should sing a hymn of praise to the accompaniment of the *cithara* in the council-house, where their statues had been erected. Beside the gods, heroes were worshipped in all Greek countries, as has been already observed; each district probably had its special protector and helper in time of need, whose sphere of activity, being confined to a small area, was all the more put to the proof and recognized within those limits. However doubtful the claims of these heroes to reverence might originally have

been, if their cults had once gained a footing, they maintained it with remarkable tenacity ; as is shown in the case of Antinous. We do not know whether the worship at Athens (in the second century A.D.) of the physician Aristomachus as the ' physician hero ' existed at a later period. In Lucian's time, sacrifice was still offered to the Scythian Toxaris, who was supposed to have saved Athens from a severe epidemic, and his gravestone cured those suffering from fever. At Chalcis in Euboea, in Plutarch's time, a priest was appointed for Titus Quinctius Flamininus, sacrifice was offered to the latter, and a panegyric in verse sung in his honour. There were temples and priests of Alexander the Great not only in Alexandria, but in many other places. As late as the sixth century the inhabitants of the oasis of Augila in the interior of Marmarica offered sacrifice to him, and a large number of temple slaves was devoted to his service ; Justinian converted them, and built a church of the Virgin Mary for them. In the time of Pausanias, not only was sacrifice offered to the Olympian victor Theagenes as a god in Thasos, but in other places in Greek and barbarian lands his statues were revered and healed sicknesses. Reverence often attached to a special statue of the hero, which was said to have proved its miraculous power. At Alexandria in the Troad there were several statues of the ' hero Neryllinus ' (probably Marcus Suillius Nerullinus, consul in 50, who administered the province of Asia as proconsul about 67–70) ; one of these was supposed to heal sicknesses and deliver oracles ; sacrifice was offered to it, and it was covered with gold and crowned with garlands. Sometimes the belief in the miraculous power of a statue was limited to the inmates of the house where it stood ; small coins and plates of silver, sometimes fastened with wax to its legs, were thankofferings from those who had been cured of fever by its aid ; impious slaves, who attempted to steal these pious gifts, were most cruelly put to death.

A belief which never doubted the repeated and supernatural revelations of the divine power and goodness was of course all the more ready to recognize the ruling hand of Providence in all the events of life which appeared quite natural or accidental to the sober-minded. The miracle, properly so called, was also nothing but one of the manifes-

tations of this power which incessantly interfered with the course of life and nature, although no doubt the most striking and convincing of them. It marked, as it were, the culminating point attained by a hundred-fold gradations of imperceptible transitions; thus, there was nothing fixed about the idea of a miracle, its recognition was subjective, conditioned by the feelings of those who believed in it, and therefore infinitely varied. Since the gods alone could perform miracles, it was from them alone that blessings could come, whether great or small. Epictetus, rebuking the Academicians, who questioned the existence of the gods, says: 'Grateful indeed are men and modest, who, if they do nothing else, are daily eating bread and yet are shameless enough to say, we do not know if there is a Demeter or her daughter Persephonē or a Pluto (the corn deities); not to mention that they are enjoying the night and the day, the seasons of the year, and the stars, and the sea and the land, and the co-operation of mankind, and yet they are not moved in any degree by these things; and do not trouble themselves about the disastrous influence that their doubts may have on the morality of other men' (*Discourses*, ii. 20, 32; chiefly from Long's translation).

Certainly many of the Stoics denied the efficacy of prayer, or, like Marcus Aurelius, advised men to leave themselves in the hands of the gods and only to pray for what was really good. Similarly Juvenal: The gods love man more than he loves himself; they know, when in our blindness we pray for a wife or the birth of a son, what will be the consequence for us if our prayer be granted; if you must ask for something, let it be for a sound mind in a sound body. The younger Pliny says that the gods rejoice more in the innocence of worshippers than in elaborate prayers; the man who enters their temples with a pure heart is more agreeable to them than one who recites a carefully prepared litany.

But such admonitions only confirm the general use of prayer, and no one can doubt that the majority of believers not only addressed themselves to the gods in all their anxieties and undertakings, but also paid them reverence and thanks in regular prayers, and commended themselves and others to their protection. Seneca even combined a belief in Fate with a belief in prayers being granted. The voices of those

offering prayers and vows would not be heard everywhere, if it was not known that the gods not only bestowed benefits of their own free will, but also in answer to prayers. They have left so many things uncertain that the use of prayers and vows may prove beneficial. Persius, like Juvenal, has made the foolish prayers of the majority the subject of a satire. It is not the sculptor, says Martial, but the man who prays that shows the gods as they really are (kind and merciful). Plutarch thought it his special duty to warn men not to believe that the prayer alone is everything; it will not be heard, nor can the help of the gods be expected, unless men help themselves. When the Jews besieged in Jerusalem gave no sign of movement on the Sabbath, even when the Romans were setting up ladders to storm the walls, they were paralysed by the bonds of superstition. God is the hope of courage and strength, not an excuse for cowardice. The pilot on a stormy sea no doubt prays that he may escape, and calls upon the saviour god, but at the same time he guides the helm, lets down the yards, and shortens sail.

The immense number of monuments and inscriptional stones of a religious character, scattered throughout the vast Roman empire, would alone be sufficient to prove, beyond all possible doubt, that during this period the gods were always regarded as the source of all blessings and the averters of all evils and dangers. These monuments attest most emphatically that the belief in an omnipresent Providence, directing the course of the world and human destinies, exercised by the gods who had been worshipped from time immemorial, as well as by those who had only become known in modern or more recent times, continued to flourish in the minds of the various populations and afforded consolation and hope in times of need and affliction of every kind to high and low, to learned and simple alike. A considerable part of these prayers, vows, thanksgivings and offerings of homage and adoration may certainly owe its origin to the outward observance of the forms of the prevailing cults, to the unreflecting force of habit or to conscious hypocrisy, but in most cases these stones afford just as many proofs beyond suspicion of a sincere, naïve and deep-seated belief. A few examples will be sufficient to give a clear idea of the nature of this belief.

In accordance with the essence of polytheism, reverence, prayers and thanks were as a rule addressed not to the whole body of divine powers, but only (as in the cult of the saints) to individual divinities, chosen partly with reference to their sphere of influence and the special efficacy and gifts attributed to them, partly for local and individual reasons. The last cannot, of course, always be indicated with certainty. When a contractor for imperial and state buildings offers thanks to the 'sacred, heavenly good goddess' (*Bona Dea*), for that with her assistance he has successfully carried an arm of the Claudian aqueduct underground, and at the same time shows his gratitude by restoring an old and ruined chapel, the 'good goddess' in this case, as frequently, is regarded as the protectress of the locality or building. On a stone near Coblenz, belonging at the latest to the age of the Antonines, a certain person thanks Mars for deliverance from frightful mental and bodily tortures; the reference here is certainly to a national Celtic divinity.

As a matter of course, thanks and prayers were addressed times without number to the national and local divinities, rather than to those whose sphere of influence embraced the favour solicited. Thus, at Smyrna, on one occasion thanks were offered for deliverance from an epidemic, not to the healing gods but to the river god Meles. A certain person set up a statue or a sanctuary at a cost of 8,000 sesterces (about £70) to the genius of a town in Numidia, on the spot 'where he had experienced the aid of his divine power'. Of course, not only natives but also strangers worshipped the divinity within whose sphere of influence they sojourned, and commended themselves to his or her protection. A Roman merchant, who traded in delicate pottery with Britain, fulfils a vow on the island of Walcheren to the local goddess Nehalennia 'for the preservation of his wares in good condition'. Titus Pomponius Victor, an official of the imperial household, who was stationed as procurator of the imperial domains at Axima in the Graian Alps (on the road from Lemens to Aosta) and probably had to take numerous journeys in connexion with his duties, addresses an elegant thanksgiving prayer in verse to the forest god Silvanus (whose image was enclosed in the hollow of a sacred oak as a natural forest chapel) for the protection hitherto afforded to him;

at the same time he promises to dedicate a thousand large trees to him, if he brings him back safe and sound to Rome with his family.

We have already mentioned the worship of the non-Roman native divinities in the northern and western provinces by Roman settlers or traders. Of the Celtic gods one of the greatest was Belenus, identified with Apollo; he was worshipped in all Celtic districts and even beyond amongst the Romans, as is shown by votive inscriptions found at Autun, Vienne, Venice and Aquileia. When the emperor Maximin (in 238) was besieging Aquileia with all his forces, the courage of the defenders was sustained by confidence in the aid of the native god Belenus; the besiegers also often saw his form hovering over the city. Herodian leaves it in doubt, whether he actually appeared to them or whether it was only an attempt to palliate the shame of their defeat by the fiction of his miraculous assistance. Yet he adds, 'the unexpected result makes anything credible'; and even a conscious fabrication in such a case shows the extent of the belief in the visible assistance of the gods, otherwise it would have had no meaning.

Travellers and wanderers in a foreign land also prayed to the local gods and performed their devotions at every place that was sacred to them. Pious wanderers, says Apuleius, lingered on their journey wherever they found a sacred grove or an altar crowned with flowers, a cave shaded by foliage, an oak hung with horns of sacrificial victims, a beech adorned with their skins, an enclosed hillock, a stump of a tree carved with an axe in the form of a statue, a plot of grass smoking with sacrificial libations, a stone moistened with fragrant essences. If the stranger performed his devotions at these centres of a simply local cult, the divine power which showed its authority in great natural phenomena the more irresistibly called for adoration. A Roman volunteer at Remagen fulfilled his vow 'to Jupiter mightiest and best, to the genius of the place, and to the Rhine', according to a stone set up in the year 190 (not the only one of this kind). But everywhere in a foreign country those who were exposed to the dangers and vicissitudes of the journey were doubly 'mindful of the gods', certainly including the native ones. A stone at Urbisaglia has preserved the memory of a present,

which an imperial freedman, Titus Flavius Maximus, sent from the east ' to the gods and goddesses of Urbssalvia '. On the other hand, at Nemausus (Nîmes) a *primipilus*, a native of Berytus, fulfils his vow to the god of his native place, the Jupiter of Heliopolis, but also to the god Nemausus. For a man always felt most directly called upon to worship the gods in whose neighbourhood he found himself ; hence the inscriptions of travellers, commending themselves to the protection and favour of the native divinities, are numerous. The primeval, colossal sanctuaries of Egypt appear to have produced the most overwhelming effect upon the religious feelings of foreign visitors, as is shown by rock-hewn inscriptions on temples, obelisks, *pylones* (gateways), etc., in most places on either side of the Nile. At Talmis (Kalabsheh) in Nubia a number of Roman centurions and soldiers posted there offer homage to the sun-god Mandulis worshipped in that district, in an inscription (year 84) in the forecourt of his temple.

But the gods were, of course, frequently called upon as gods of a special activity, because, and in so far as they manifested it in a certain place. Thus, for example, at Alba Julia (Carlsburg on the Marosch) a Roman veteran fulfils his vow ' after a vision ', also in the name of his wife and daughter ' to Aesculapius and Hygiea and the other healing gods and goddesses of this place ', in gratitude for the restoration of his eyesight. In many cases the efficiency of the god was limited to a definite locality. Thus, the thanks of patients cured in a bath are naturally addressed to the nymphs of the spring ; in many baths votive tablets of Roman visitors have been found, at Ischia for Apollo and ' the nymphs of the nitre-springs '. Other healing springs, near which inscriptions to the nymphs have been found, are e.g. those of Les Fumades (dépt. du Gard), Varasdin-Teplitz, Tüffers near Cilli, Bagnères de Bigorre, Loprésti haspól, and others. A votive tablet found near the hot springs at Vif is dedicated to ' the spirits of the eternal fire '. At the baths of Hercules (as they are still called) in Transylvania, thanks are offered to the ' health-bringing Hercules ', as the god who on his wanderings through the world discovered all the hot springs, A hunter, who had been cured of a swelling in the joints (the result of a bite from an Etruscan wild boar) by the baths

of Solfatara near Tivoli, to show his gratitude for being able to mount his horse again, set up an equestrian statue of himself in marble to the goddess of the spring (Lymfa). The nymphs were also thanked for the discovery of new springs (or their divinities were worshipped as 'the new' or 'newly discovered' nymphs), or for the reappearance of a dried-up spring. A magistrate of Lambaesis in Numidia dedicated an altar in token of special rejoicing, because in the year he held office the nymph 'had given our city Lambaesis an abundant supply of water'. An inscription at Auzia in Mauretania announces the offering of a sacrificial gift to the mountain spirit, 'who wards off the violence of the storms from our native town'. Near the old marble quarries of Martignac in the neighbourhood of the Pyrenees a votive tablet records the thanks of two Roman contractors or proprietors 'who first quarried and carried out from them columns 20 feet long', 'to Silvanus and the spirits of the Numidian mountains'. A cavalry officer serving in Britain, who fulfilled his vow to Silvanus, because he had aided him to catch a mighty wild boar, which had escaped all his predecessors, certainly imagined that the forest god had his home in this particular wood. Wood-sawyers and timber-merchants also worshipped him. About the time of Trajan a legate of the seventh legion set up in its standing quarters (? Leon in Asturia or Gallicia) a temple to Diana, 'in order that he might be able to hit with the javelin the flying deer, the stag, the bristly boar, and the breed of forest horses', and offered her from the spoils of the chase boars' teeth, stags' horns and a bear's skin. Inscriptions in various places in Spain offer thanks to the goddess of Turobriga for recovery of health, some one in Emerita in Lusitania also appeals to her to punish the thief who has stolen six tunics, two linen overcoats, a shirt, etc. Some one who has lost a ring promises half of it as a present to the god Nodon (in the south-west of Britain), if he recovers it. In a very ungrammatical sentence he adds: 'If amongst those who now have the ring there is any one named Senecianus, do not permit him to enjoy health, until he brings the ring to thy temple'.

Although the number of the gods, who were invoked either in all cases or at least by preference in definite places was exceedingly large, since it was at least equivalent to the

number of the more respected sanctuaries and centres of worship, yet on the other hand every god was everywhere solicited for the assistance or the gift, which he above all other gods was believed to be able to grant. This holds good not only of the greater gods, but also of the inferior and the least important. Even the cult of those countless protecting and auxiliary powers of the old Roman religion, whose action was restricted to definite cases or to certain spheres, and whose functions, according to the Christian belief, were performed by angels, continued to hold its ground under numerous forms. Of course, we cannot expect to find a great amount of evidence for the worship of these very subordinate protecting spirits, who only act at intervals. Yet, as Tertullian assures us that the day on which the child was able to stand on its legs for the first time was always sacred to the goddess Statina, we may assume that others of those divinities, who watched over the most critical moments of human life, still lived on in the popular belief. Waggoners and muleteers still swore by the (originally Celtic) goddess of horses, Epona, whose little chapel was usually in a niche of the main girder which supported the roof of the stable. There her image was crowned on feast days with roses and other flowers; images representing her, for use in stables, are still in existence. In places where foul or suffocating vapours ascended from the ground (Beneventum, Cremona) worship was offered to the goddess Mefitis.

But, however firmly the people clung to these countless ministering divinities, since their less important but clearly defined activity brought them nearer to a section of the faithful, whose longing for intercourse with the supernatural world they were better able to satisfy than the superior gods, whose omnipotence and majesty rather kept the human heart at a respectful distance; yet the latter, as most powerful governors of the world and special agents of Providence, still continued to be the most ardently worshipped and the most universally invoked. Everywhere the soldier prayed to father Mars, the mariner to Neptune, the merchant, the tradesman and the careful householder to Mercury, 'the dispenser and preserver of profits', the artist and artisan to Minerva, the countryman to Ceres, women with child to Diana and Lucina; parted lovers (in Greece at least) to

the god of love; in one of Plutarch's dialogues one of the speakers tells how his parents, soon after their marriage, which had been long delayed in consequence of a family quarrel, made a pilgrimage to Thespiae, in accordance with a vow each had made to sacrifice to Eros. The more extended their sphere of influence and the more general their worship, the more frequently the gods were appealed to. In the East, the aid of Heracles, the invincible, who overcame all terrors and dangers, was invoked in all perils by land and sea, and in sickness.

Undoubtedly, however, prayers were most commonly addressed to the supreme god, as the thunderer, the lightning hurler, the lord of storms and of the clear sky; in times of drought, processions of women, barefooted and with dishevelled hair, ascended a hill and prayed to him for rain. On the mountain heights where he was worshipped, as Jupiter of Vesuvius, of the Apennines, etc., he was felt to be less remote from man. At the top of the Great St. Bernard pass, a district whose inhabitants (the Celtic Veragri) in Hannibal's time worshipped the god Poeninus, up to the eleventh century there stood, between the hospice (dedicated to St. Bernard in 926) and the lake (frozen during eight months of the year), in which numerous offerings and coins have been found, the recently discovered temple of Jupiter, from which the mountain was formerly called Mont Joux (mons Jovis). There, 'where the terrors of the mountains confront the wanderer to a far greater extent than on the other passes', in addition to 1,600 coins and numerous other offerings, fifty bronze votive tablets have been found presented by soldiers and other Roman travellers, who fulfilled their vows to Jupiter Poeninus, mightiest and best, for their safe journey and return. But his almighty will not only controlled nature; he was the 'controller of things human and divine and lord of destinies', and in that capacity guardian, preserver, victor, god of battles and bringer of peace, consummator of every enterprise, saviour in all times of need and danger. Every interest, great or small, public or private, was commended to him; his omnipotence was revealed in every event. A high official of senatorial rank fulfils his vow to Jupiter in Campania, 'because in this place he has been preserved from imminent danger and has recovered his health'; a

steward of the distinguished family of the Roscii performs a vow to him as the preserver of the property of this family (in the neighbourhood of Brescia). At Apollonia in Phrygia a Galatian dedicated an altar to him, with two oxen in relief, because he had preserved the life of men and cattle in time of famine, led him back in safety to his native land, and bestowed fame upon his son amongst the Trocmi. An inhabitant of Apulum (Carlsburg on the Marosch) fulfilled his vow 'in return for his own safety and that of his relatives', because he had been delivered from the violence of the Carpi, who in the third century frequently invaded the province of Dacia.

In the Etruscan town of Tuder 'an infamous slave of the commune with frightful cunning' had buried a tablet with the names of all the *decuriones* (town councillors), in order to 'devote' them to the powers of the under-world. But the supreme god had revealed the crime, handed over the perpetrator to punishment, and delivered the town and citizens from the fear of the danger that threatened. In return for this, a freedman specially distinguished by the town made a vow for the prosperity of the town, the town council and the people of Tuder, 'to Jupiter greatest and best, guardian and preserver'.

It would be superfluous to multiply examples taken from Roman inscriptional stones; those already given will suffice to make clear the nature of the belief in a Providence exercised by the gods. The number and variety of these stones, found throughout all parts of the Roman world, justify the assumption that the belief to which they bear witness extended over an equally large area. Even supposing that a considerable number of these memorials may be the work of unbelievers or indifferentists, who desired to support the prevailing forms of cult by recognizing them or at least not opposing them, on the other hand such concessions or compromises could only have been possible in the face of a belief whose predominance was undisputed. Against the fact of this predominance there is no scintilla of evidence in the entire Greek and Roman literature of the period, but much that expressly and irrefutably confirms it. In view of the great progress of Epicureanism, it is certainly credible that the number of those who disbelieved in a Providence was considerable, but it was no more possible then

than at any other time even for the most careful and far-seeing observers to define even approximately the numbers of unbelievers and believers respectively. The vague expressions of authors, who in a general way discuss contemporary religious affairs, add nothing to our knowledge. Statements such as that of Pliny, that some men take no account of the gods and that blind chance is reverenced as a divinity; or of Juvenal, that in the opinion of many everything depends upon chance, no one rules the world, but nature herself orders the course of events; or of Philo the Jew, that many believe that everything in the world moves without superior guidance by virtue of its innate force, and that the laws and customs, the rights and duties of men have been established solely by human intelligence—such statements are only an inaccurate paraphrase of the Epicurean doctrine, which, as endorsing the opinion that chance prevails in human affairs, Tacitus also sets against the Stoic belief in Providence. The widespread belief in an unalterable *Fatum*, attested by him as well as by Pliny, by no means excludes the belief in Providence; the Stoic school also, as is well-known, succeeded in combining the two. In Plutarch, also, who (in his *De Superstitione*) treated superstition and unbelief as aberrations in opposite directions from true piety, by atheists are chiefly to be understood Epicureans. There is no indication of the numerical relation between them and believers, but if Plutarch, whose religious tendencies were so closely akin to superstition, nevertheless declares atheism to be the less harmful error, we can hardly believe that he feared any peril to religion from its diffusion. Had the spread of the materialistic view of the world been calculated to arouse anxiety and offend the pious, Plutarch would hardly have recognized it as a natural reaction against excessive superstition and handled it so tenderly.

That belief in the gods was general and unbelievers few and far between, is asserted not only by Maximus of Tyre but also by Apuleius: 'the ignorant masses, uninitiated into philosophy, void of holiness and true knowledge, destitute of piety, without a share in truth, treat the gods without respect, partly with over-anxious reverence, partly with insolent disdain, some through superstition, others through unbelief, some full of fear, others full of self-complacency.

For most people worship the whole company of gods, dwelling high up in aether, far removed from contact with men, but not in the right way ; all people fear them, but through ignorance ; few deny their existence, and these from godlessness '. According to this, at that time at least the number of atheists and materialists, although in itself considerable, only formed a small minority as compared with the large number of believers. This view is in the main confirmed by Lucian, whose evidence in this case carries all the more weight, since he would undoubtedly have preferred to be able to state the contrary. The gods, uneasy about the future of their cult, are present at a public debate between an Epicurean who denies, and a Stoic who defends the belief in Providence. The latter is disgracefully worsted in argument. Then says Mercury : ' But what is the harm if a few return home with this conviction ? For the number of those who hold the opposite opinion is great—the majority of the Hellenes, the mass of the people, and all barbarians '.

However greatly the number of the gods of the ancient world may have been increased by the admission *en masse* of oriental and barbarian divinities, no alteration took place in the relation of believers to the divinity. The increase and multiplication of divine personalities had rather facilitated than impeded intercourse with the higher world for weak and helpless humanity, which, as Pliny correctly observes, could only grasp the idea of the divinity by breaking it up into an infinite number of individuals. Not only did the belief in a Providence exercised by the gods continue to be indispensable to the vast majority of mankind, but without cessation it demanded and created the miracle ; and it was not women and the multitude alone, as the enlightened Strabo thought, who felt the need of ' legends and miraculous tales '. It is to be hoped that our investigations have sufficiently shown that, throughout the domain of Graeco-Roman civilization, the world of gods, the result of the fusion of the two religions, on the whole maintained its sway, notwithstanding the reputation acquired by new importations, and, in spite of all admixture, re-established its authority over the minds of men.

In conclusion, we have still to consider the question of cult, the influence of which in continually strengthening

and reviving belief must be rated very highly. Even a complete inundation of the West by the religions of the East would never have eradicated the belief in the old gods, so long as their cults, which, most intimately connected with public and private life, consecrated and added solemnity to the most important crises in both, ever claiming attention and captivating the mind, the soul and the imagination in various ways, continued to exist everywhere in the traditional forms. So long as the temples 'dignified by the personal presence of the divinities inhabiting them rather than distinguished by ornament and enriched by gifts', invited men to prayer; so long as numerous solemnities, festivities, and religious ceremonies of all kinds (sacrifices, processions, and spectacles) continually and most emphatically recalled the power, greatness and glory of the gods and their relation to mankind; so long was it impossible for human belief to turn aside from the paths prescribed for it by the venerable tradition of so many centuries and approved by countless generations as leading to truth.

Not only is the persistence in late antiquity of all Greek and Roman cults of importance an undisputed fact, but also the retention of obscure and local cults, ceremonies, usages and forms which were no longer intelligible is amply attested in the case of so many different lands that, considering this extremely tenacious vitality of religious tradition, any great or essential diminution of it in the course of centuries appears on the whole inconceivable.

The Roman ritual was preserved, at least in great measure, down to the last days of antiquity, in forms which owed their origin to a period anterior to the beginnings of Roman history, and are based upon those very ancient ideas of the world of gods prevalent in Latium long before the Roman religion was inundated by the Greek. The liturgical hymns, in part unintelligible even to the priests who year by year chanted them according to instructions, contained the invocations of the gods under the names given to them by the oldest settlers on the hills on the bank of the Tiber, now long since obsolete; year in, year out, a religious ceremony, of equally high antiquity, was performed by the priests with the same punctilious accuracy. The stations (*mansiones*) for the procession of the priests called Salii, in which the

ancilia (sacred shields) were deposited for one night, were probably restored after 382. The calendar of Philocalus (compiled in 354 from official sources) still specifies a considerable number of the religious festivals supposed to have been instituted by Numa (i.e. in existence from time immemorial), as state festivals celebrated in Rome at that time. The oldest cults were just those which survived the longest, 'when the more spiritual worships of historic times had long since fallen victims to the religion of the cross'; for instance, the procession on March 16 and 17 to the twenty-four chapels of the Argei (puppets of rushes or straw), which were hurled into the Tiber on May 13 (customs undoubtedly referring to the incoming and death of the spirit of spring); and the sacrifice of a horse (*October equus*) crowned with loaves (for whose head two of the oldest regions of the city contended) which took place at the harvest thanksgiving (October 15) on the Campus Martius. The equally ancient festival of Lupercalia lasted till 494, the day of its celebration (February 15) being changed by Pope Gelasius I into the festival of the purification of Mary.

But the continuance for a thousand years of forms of cult, unaltered and as it were fossilized, is most clearly shown by the minutes of the *fratres Arvales* (the field-brethren), the only surviving acts of a religious association. This brotherhood, usually composed in imperial times of men of the highest rank and the emperors themselves, celebrated in May a three days' festival in honour of the 'divine goddess' (*Dea Dia*, a very old name for the maternal earth-goddess, dispenser of the blessing of corn) to secure the growth of the seed then beginning to sprout, in her sacred grove of primeval trees as yet untouched by the axe, situated five miles from Rome on the road to Campania. Whenever an iron axe was used within the precincts of the grove; when a tree was blown down, or fell from decay or was struck by lightning; whenever, in fact, any iron implement was brought into it, a propitiatory offering was necessary; the prohibition of the use of iron is to be explained by the fact that at the time to which these ritual laws go back, the metal was unknown. Among the solemnities of the second day of the festival, the priests shut themselves up in the temple and touched certain pots, with fervent prayers and adjurations. The most recent

discoveries in the grove of the Arvales have brought to light potsherds of rudest manufacture, fashioned by hand without the aid of the potter's wheel, which are only found elsewhere in Latium under the peperin (i.e. the lava of the long-extinct volcanoes of the Alban mountain range). 'They were evidently the pots for boiling the grain, at a time when corn, instead of being made into bread, was beaten to a pulp'. Later in the day, the priests, after all who were not members of the college had left the temple, shut themselves up in the sanctuary, tucked up their tunics for the dance, and sang or recited a prayer to Mars and the Lares (or Lases) to avert destruction 'in Latin which must have been obsolete 400 years before Cicero, and was as unintelligible to them as the Kyrie Eleison to the sacristan; for which reason the service-book was handed to each priest beforehand by the attendants'. The text of this litany, contained in a protocol drawn up in 218 during the reign of Heliogabalus (Elagabalus) is the oldest known document in the Latin language. At that time perhaps a thousand years had passed since the 'field-brethren' had invoked Dea Dia for the first time. In the course of these thousand years, the face of the inhabited world was almost entirely changed. The city on the Tiber, once a country village, had become the centre of a world-empire; its morning and noon had passed, its evening was at hand. The occupant of the throne set up by Augustus was a priest of the sun from Syria, a thoroughly despised and frequently humiliated country. And yet still could be heard the ancient chant, the words of which the kings of Rome had once listened to with reverence—

> Help us, O Lases!
> O Mars, Mars, let not death and destruction overtake so many!
> Be sated, O cruel Mars!

In the rest of Italy, also, very ancient local cults held their ground with the same tenacity against all destructive influences; in upper Italy Celtic, in the district of Verona Raetian, in Toscana Etruscan, especially the cult of Nortia, the goddess of destiny, at Volsinii (Bolsena). Juvenal speaks of Nortia as the patron goddess of Sejanus, who was a native of Volsinii, and as late as the fourth century the Volsinian Rufius Festus Avienus (proconsul of Africa 366, of Achaia

372, and a poet of repute) calls himself a worshipper of Nortia. Similarly, other families from Italian towns who had settled in Rome clung to their native cults, the Turpiliani to that of Feronia, chiefly worshipped at Terracina and Soractē, but also at many other places in Italy. The goddess Vacuna, by whose ruined temple in the neighbourhood of his Sabine farm Horace dictated the epistle to his friend Aristius Fuscus, was worshipped at several places in Sabine territory; her most famous sanctuary was a grove in the plain of Rieti, where the Velino flows into the Veline lake. On the other hand, the reputation of other local divinities, like that of the aldermen of small towns, as Tertullian scoffingly remarks, did not extend beyond the outskirts; thus the cult of Delventinus was limited to Casinum, of Numiternus to Atina, of Visidianus to Narnia, of Ancharia to Asculum, of Valentia to Ocriculum, of Hostia to Sutrium. A temple of the goddess Cupra in the town of the same name on the coast of Picenum was restored by Hadrian. Curious festivals, attended by crowds of pilgrims and sightseers from all quarters, and singular usages continued in existence in different places. As late as the time of Marcus Aurelius the priesthood of Diana of Nemi was bestowed upon the man who, after he had broken off a branch from a certain tree in her grove, slew the holder of the office for the time being in a duel; at that time the candidates for this reward of blood were runaway slaves.

The astonishingly numerous and manifold local cults, in great part also dating from remote antiquity, often singular, sometimes barbarous and even horrible, which continued to exist in Greece, are known to us chiefly from Plutarch, Pausanias, and inscriptional monuments. Some characteristic examples will be sufficient to show the superabundance and manysidedness of the Greek cults, and the amazing tenacity with which immemorial traditions held their ground. At Patrae, the festival of Artemis Laphria was celebrated in the following manner. Round the large sacrificial altar green trunks of trees, each sixteen ells long, were planted in a circle within which piles of the driest wood were heaped up. On the first day a magnificent procession took place, in which the maiden priestess of Artemis, on a car drawn by stags, brought up the rear. On the second day the sacrifice took place, to which both the township and individuals vied with each other

in contributing. All the victims were thrown alive on the altar, consisting of edible birds, wild boars, deer, roe, wolves and bears and their cubs; then the fire was lighted. If a bear or other animal succeeeded in getting loose and escaping, it was at once dragged back again, yet no one was ever injured by any of these animals.

In the same town, an image of Dionysus Aesymnetes ('president') was worshipped; it was enclosed in a chest which, according to the legend, had been carried away from Troy at the time of its capture. Nine men, chosen by the people from the most distinguished inhabitants, and the same number of women, conducted the service. On a fixed night during the festival, the priest carried the chest out of the temple. Then all the children went out of the city to the river Meilichus, their heads crowned with ears of corn. According to the legend, it was in this manner that the children who were sacrificed to Artemis were crowned in olden times. They deposited the crowns at the feet of Artemis, bathed in the river, wreathed their heads with ivy, and then repaired to the temple of Dionysus. Near the river Crathis there was a sanctuary of 'the broad-bosomed earth-goddess' with a very old image of wood. The priestesses were obliged to live a chaste life, and those appointed to the office must have known only one man. The truth of their declaration was proved by a draught of bull's blood; those who failed to stand the ordeal were instantly punished. When several candidates were equally qualified, the selection was decided by lot. At Titanē in Sicyonia there was a temple of Asclepius, much frequented by sick persons who lived in the neighbourhood; inside the temple precincts stood some old cypress trees. Only the head, hands and feet of the image were to be seen; the rest of the body was wrapped in a woollen shirt and cloak. A statue of Hygiea (Health) by its side was completely covered with women's hair, cut off in honour of the goddess, and with strips of Babylonian raiment. Hard by was an altar of the winds, to which the priest offered sacrifice one night in every year, at the same time secretly throwing victims into four pits to assuage the fury of the winds; he also sang incantations, composed, it was said, by the old enchantress Medea. At Troezen, near the temple of the Muses, there was an altar of Sleep, to whom sacrifice was

offered as well as to the Muses, since this god was said to be their greatest favourite. But the chief object of worship at Troezen was Hippolytus, the son of Theseus, to whom a magnificent temple was erected. The inhabitants denied that he had met his death by being dragged along by his horses; they asserted that he had been carried up to heaven, where he was to be seen in the constellation Auriga (Charioteer). His priest held office for life, and a yearly festival was celebrated in his honour; every maiden cut off a lock of her hair before marriage and deposited it in his temple. At the festivals of Dionysus the outward signs of religious frenzy, the eating of raw meat, the strangling and tearing to pieces of snakes by the Bacchantes still continued. The shedding of human blood, obligatory in certain cults, was a survival of human sacrifice. According to the legend credited by Pausanias, the image of Artemis Orthia at Sparta was the very one that Orestes had carried off from the temple at Tauri; the goddess still required her altar to be sprinkled with human blood, for which purpose youths were still flogged at her altar till they bled. The priestess held the little wooden image of the goddess in her arm; if the scourgers flogged a boy lightly owing to his beauty or rank, it grew so heavy that she could not carry it. Plutarch says that even in his time many died under the blows; those who bore the flogging most unflinchingly were distinguished for life by the title of 'conquerors at the altar.' At Alea in Arcadia, during a festival of Dionysus, women were flogged in obedience to an utterance of the Delphic oracle. At Orchomenus in Boeotia, at the Agrionia, the priest of Dionysus, sword in hand, every year pursued the supposed female descendants of the curse-laden daughters of Minyas; he was at liberty to kill the woman whom he caught, as the priest Zoilus actually did in Plutarch's time. But this pious frenzy brought down the wrath of the gods not only upon Zoilus, who died of a horrible disease, but also upon the city, which was grievously afflicted; the inhabitants deprived the family of Zoilus of the priesthood, which was subsequently conferred by election. According to Lactantius, human sacrifices were offered to Zeus in Cyprus, until Hadrian forbade them; even under Marcus Aurelius it was believed that they were secretly offered to Zeus Lycaeus in Arcadia. In Rhodes, also, a human victim is said to have been offered to

Cronus every year, usually a criminal deserving of death (as at the festival of Jupiter Latiaris in Rome).

Our knowledge of the state of religion in Greece, down to the end of the second century and even later, as already observed, gives us the impression that the intrusion of new foreign cults no more affected or changed the essential character of the native cults than the introduction of the worship of Adonis, Cybele and Ammon in earlier times. And yet the rites of the Egyptian divinities, Isis, Osiris and Serapis (introduced at least as early as the fourth century B.C.) enjoyed a great popularity and reputation on the Greek continent as well as the islands. About the time of the birth of Christ, the worship of the Syrian Aphrodite and of the Syrian Adad and Atergatis (sun-god and earth-goddess) were associated with these in Delos; traces of Mithras worship have been found in Athens and Thera; and Lucian's jokes about the motley crowd of gods makes it probable that many other eastern gods had found a home in Greece. Bendis, Anubis, Mithras and others are present at the discussion concerning Providence. In much-frequented harbours at least, such as Corinth and Rhodes, foreign cults must have been numerous, while in the desolate and unvisited interior the old cults probably maintained a more or less exclusive ascendancy. If it is certain that countless old Roman and Greek cults continued to exist in the times of the theocrasy, it is no less certain that regular participation in religious worship was everywhere so general, that entire omission of the usual sacred rites gave offence or attracted attention as exceptional. The philosopher Demonax was even accused at Athens, since no one ever saw him offer sacrifice and he alone had not been initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries; yet he knew how to calm the storm that threatened him in the assembly, where many had stones ready to hurl at him. Sicinius Aemilianus of Oea, the accuser of Apuleius, was called Mezentius (the name of the well-known 'despiser of the gods' in Virgil) for his notorious impiety. He had never prayed to a god, never entered a temple; when he passed a sanctuary, he never so much as showed his respect by kissing his hand. He never even offered a portion of the harvest nor the firstlings of the flock to the gods of the country, who clothed and nourished him; his property contained no sanctuary, no grove, nor consecrated ground. Those who had visited it

declared that not even a stone was to be seen sprinkled with fragrant essences nor a branch of a tree hung with garlands. Martial commended the sanctuaries on his little property at Nomentum to the care of a certain Marius, to whom he had transferred it; the pines and holm-oaks dedicated to the Fauns, the altars of Jupiter and Silvanus ('often stained with the blood of a lamb or a goat') erected by the inexperienced hand of the bailiff; further, chapels or temples of Diana and Mars and a laurel-grove sacred to Flora. He hoped that Marius, when offering sacrifice, would also commend him to the care of the gods and beg them to grant both what one of them might wish. From youth upwards familiarity with an enormous number of forms of ritual exercised an irresistible influence on Roman life. Children of tender years, says Prudentius (end of the fourth century) tasted the sacrificial meal, saw the smoke-begrimed images of the Lares sprinkled with fragrant essences, their mothers praying anxiously before the statue of the goddess of destiny with the *cornu copiæ* (horn of plenty), and, while still in their nurses' arms, kissed the images of the gods and addressed them in childish prayers.

The universal practice of sacrificing on all joyful occasions is amply attested for all classes of society. Persius ridicules property owners who pray to Mercury for the increase of their live stock, and at the same time diminish it by the frequent sacrifice of heifers. Whenever a senator was promoted to consular rank, 'the fore-court of the palace smoked with the blood of young steers'. During the absence of Augustus from Rome a senator named Rufus, in a moment of intoxication, let slip the joke that all the bulls and calves prayed that he might never return. A similar jest concerning the prayers of the white cows during the campaigns of Marcus Aurelius has already been mentioned. Juvenal offered sacrifice for the deliverance of his friend Catullus from the perils of the sea to the three Capitoline divinities—two lambs and a young ox; had he been rich, he would have substituted a fat steer of noble breed for the ox. The fees paid by the faithful for admission to the temples, for the offering of the sacrifice, and the throwing in of the gift, often made the office of priest a very lucrative one; hence they were farmed on account of the state or community, and even sold by auction in some towns of Asia Minor (in Egypt this was done on account of the emperors as

successors of the Ptolemies). A tariff of the sacrificial fees is still in existence. One of the most remarkable results of the spread of Christianity in the province of Pontus (according to Pliny in his well-known letter to Trajan in the year 112) was that the temples, no doubt those of Amisus and the neighbouring localities in the first place, were almost deserted, the sacred festivals were not celebrated, and there was scarcely any demand for sacrificial victims. However, this state of affairs, which both surprised and disquieted Pliny, was somewhat improved by the measures taken by him against the Christians. We may form some idea of the enormous extent to which animals were used for sacrificial purposes from the statement of Suetonius, that as a result of the general rejoicings at the accession of Caligula more than 160,000 victims were sacrificed in Rome alone in less than three months. Even in the time of Prudentius, the Sacred Way resounded with the bellowing of oxen driven to the Capitol for sacrifice.

But above all, it is clear from the numerous inscriptional stones that have been preserved, that pious believers continued to show their zeal and activity on behalf of their faith by building temples and keeping them in repair, by adorning them with images of the gods, and by gifts, offerings and benefactions of every kind. Even at the time when religion is usually supposed to have been at its lowest ebb, Lucretius wrote : ' that awe is still deep-rooted in the minds of men, which has called forth religious belief and the adoration of the gods ; which causes new temples of the gods to be erected over the whole earth, and fills them on festal days with crowds of visitors'. Certainly, it is no proof of a general decline of belief that, during a period of uninterrupted and fearful political convulsions, some of the very numerous temples and sanctuaries in Rome were destroyed and their sites illegally appropriated even by private individuals. If the number of those which needed restoration and were actually restored by Augustus in 28 B.C. was really eighty-two, it is a question whether this number should be considered large or small, in view of the total number of such buildings.

The number of buildings, donations and benefactions given by private individuals for religious purposes was enormous, as is shown by inscriptions from Italy and all the provinces. Some of these, no doubt, owe their origin to other than religi-

ous motives ; but it is equally certain that in most cases these pious offerings and gifts were presented to earn or retain the favour of the gods or to quiet an uneasy conscience ; many, according to the inscriptions, were given ' after a vision ' or ' by command ' or ' admonition ' of the divinity in a dream. According to this evidence, we may assume that a considerable number of the temples throughout the empire were built by private individuals at their own expense, who sometimes in addition assigned a capital sum for the upkeep of the building. In Italy especially—where in Appian's time (i.e. under Antoninus Pius) the wealthiest temples, next to that of Jupiter on the Capitol, were those at Antium and Lanuvium, that of Hercules at Tibur, and that of Diana at Aricia—the well-to-do inhabitants of municipal towns vied with their countrymen who had attained high rank at Rome, and with the patrons and other protectors of their towns, in showing their munificence and attachment to their native place ; above all, by providing it with worthy dwellings for the gods. For example, a certain Publius Lucilius Gamala (who lived from about 117 to 180) built or restored seven temples at Ostia—of Vulcan, of Castor and Pollux, of Venus, of Spes (Hope), of Fortune, of Ceres and of father Tiberinus (the deified personification of the Tiber). Martial's friend Caesius Sabinus built a temple for the nymph of a lake at Sassina. A husband and wife at Assisi built a temple, apparently of Castor and Pollux, and in addition provided the statues. In Malta a private individual spent 110,792½ sesterces (about £1,110) on the erection of a marble temple of Apollo. Great landowners also looked after the country temples on their property ; thus, Pliny repaired a ruined temple of Ceres on one of his estates. In addition to entirely new buildings and the restoration and completion of dilapidated sanctuaries, offerings, repairs of individual parts, and special buildings of all kinds (altars, sacrificial kitchens, pillars and capitals, pediments, floors, ornaments, etc.), donations and benefactions for religious purposes are very frequently mentioned on the inscriptional stones.

Images of the gods, some of them very costly, were especially common in temples. Thus, a priestess of Aeclanum presented a silver statue of Felicitas ; a cavalry officer at Formiae bequeathed 100,000 sesterces (about £1,000) for a silver processional car of Minerva weighing 100 lb. with all

accessories; probably the temple statue of the goddess was also of precious metal. A woman left directions in her will for the erection of the statue of a god, weighing 100 lb., in a certain temple in her native town, with her name subscribed; the question then arose, whether her heirs might provide one of bronze or whether they would be compelled to make one of silver or gold. The famous jurist Cervidius Scaevola (tutor of Septimius Severus), in view of the fact that all the offerings in the temple were of silver or bronze, decided that the statue must be of silver. A silver statuette of Mercury at Lambaesis cost 14,000 sesterces (about £140), a silver statue at Hippo Regius more than 51,000, a similar one at Vienne 100,000. Pious believers who were unable to offer such expensive gifts, had the images of divinities at least gilded, entirely or in part, e.g. the feet, but especially the face or beard. Thus at Corfinium 'a servant (female) of the great mother had the great mother repaired and gilded, the hair of Attis gilded and Bellona repaired'; at the same time the priest of Attis had an altar and silver moon made for him.

Further, the images of the gods were provided with articles of clothing, attributes, ornaments and valuables according to the means of the worshipper. In his youth the emperor Galba dreamed that Fortuna stood before his door, seeking admission; on awaking he found a bronze statue of the goddess on the threshold, which he personally removed to his estate at Tusculum, and all his life showed his reverence for it by monthly supplications and a yearly vigil. Shortly before his death he kept ready a carefully selected necklace of pearls and precious stones to adorn the statue, but finally resolved to offer it to Venus on the Capitol; whereupon Fortuna appeared to him in a dream and threatened to take back her gifts. As a rule such pious gifts were, of course, intended for temple statues. For instance, in a temple at Puteoli a certain person, prompted by a dream, had a snake (probably that of Aesculapius) made at his own expense. An *augustalis*[1] of Ariminum left instructions in his will for the erection of a statue, apparently of a Bacchant (in a temple of Bacchus) with a golden necklace, a thyrsus, and a silver goblet 2½ lb. in weight. At Reii (Riez in the south of France) a man and his wife, in

[1] The *augustales* were a religious association at Rome, which kept up the worship of the deified emperors.

fulfilment of a vow, offered to Aesculapius, ' to show their gratitude for the surprising effect of the power of the god which they had themselves experienced,' a bronze statue of the god of sleep (they had perhaps been cured of sleeplessness) and some valuables—a gold chain of little snakes and a silver writing tablet. At Acci in Hispania Tarraconensis a grandmother, in honour of her granddaughter, offered Isis a statue or some other offering, weighing 112¾ lb. of silver, besides a set of pearls, emeralds and other precious stones for the head, neck and other parts of the body, including, according to the list, two emeralds and two pearls for the ears ; two diamond rings for the little finger ; a ring with emeralds, various stones and a pearl for the next finger ; an emerald ring for the midle finger ; eight precious stones cut in the form of a cylinder, for the shoes. Frequently (as at Riez) statues of other gods than those to which they were consecrated were presented to the temples ; and donations were given, which had no reference to the cult, but were intended to enhance the beauty and magnificence of the temples, and to increase their stock of treasures. Thus, a citizen of Rhegium bequeathed to the temple of Apollo in his native place a small parchment book with ivory covers, an ivory case, and nineteen pictures.

The fact that gold and silver votive offerings (some of them very valuable) even in second-rate towns of both east and west (such as Ostia) are frequently mentioned ; that the gifts of Augustus to five temples in Rome (those of Jupiter Capitolinus, Divus Julius, Apollo, Vesta, and Mars the Avenger) from the spoils of war, reached a total value of about 100,000,000 sesterces (about £1,000,000) ; that old and damaged temple gifts, used by Hadrian for the construction of a statue at Lanuvium, amounted to 3 lb. of gold and 206 lb. of silver ; these and similar considerations would justify the assumption that the Roman empire probably contained not a few temples whose votive offerings were not inferior in number and value to those of the former treasure-chapel of the Casa Santa (Holy-House) at Loreto. Such treasures, in addition to the moneys and valuables frequently deposited in consecrated buildings, needed protection, for which purpose the military posts already mentioned were established near the temples. Those temples, whose divinities, in accordance with resolutions of the senate or imperial decrees, could be appointed heirs, were probably

the wealthiest : such were those of Jupiter on the Capitol, of Apollo at Miletus, of Mars in Gaul (?), of Minerva at Ilium, of Hercules at Gades, of Diana at Ephesus, of the Mother of the Gods from Sipylus at Smyrna, and of the 'heavenly (moon) goddess' at Carthage.

Nor were the priests and temple attendants forgotten. In reference to the clause in a lady's will, desiring her heirs to pay the sum of 10 *denarii* 'to the priest, the caretaker and the other freedmen' of a certain temple, 'on the day of the yearly market instituted by her in the neighbourhood,' Scaevola decided that the payment must be made annually.

There is no doubt that the worship of images, the contemplation of the divinity present in the image, which irresistibly influenced even rebellious and wavering souls, and the possibility of adoring the divinity in person and in some sort holding communication with him face to face, more than anything else in the cult tended to maintain and strengthen belief. Although some philosophers, like Seneca, rejected the worship of images, others, like Maximus of Tyre, insisted, with much reason, that the weakness of human nature, which is as far removed from God as earth is from heaven, needed signs perceptible by the senses in order to grasp the idea of the divinity, and that few could dispense with them. He added that the most worthy of all the different symbols of the divine beings in use amongst different peoples was the human form, as bearing the greatest likeness to God.

We need no evidence to show that the naïve belief of the masses instinctively and unconsciously transformed the image into the god himself, and that each god was split up into as many personalities as there were famous images of him. Similarly, the modern Italian believes in different Madonnas, the modern Greek in different Panagias. Even at the present day in Greece and the south of Italy ancient images of the gods are worshipped as local patron saints ; e.g. a mutilated Ariadne at Monteleone as Santa Venere, who is especially invoked in diseases of women. The removal of a colossal statue of Demeter from Eleusis in 1801 (now at Cambridge), to whose beneficence the blessings of the harvest were attributed, called forth as loud laments as the removal of Ceres from Enna by Verres, an outrage which was regarded throughout Sicily as the cause of the ruin of agriculture. In ancient times the lips, hands

and feet of the images of the gods were perceptibly worn by the frequent osculations of the devout. Suppliants begged the attendant to put them as close to the ear of the image as possible, that they might obtain a better hearing; they whispered into it prayers and vows which they wished to keep secret; they attached waxen tablets on which their vows were recorded to the knees of the image, that the god might not forget the object of their desires. But if their prayers were not granted, they cursed and threatened the gods, as the Christians in late times the saints. Paulinus of Nola, quite in accordance with reality, tells how a peasant rudely informs St. Felix that he expects him to recover his two oxen that had been stolen; 'the martyr was greatly amused at the peasant's uncouthness, and he and the Lord laughed at his abuse'. Similarly, according to Epictetus, farmers, when the weather was bad, and sailors when there was a storm, hurled curses at Jupiter.

But disappointed suppliants, whether in ancient or modern times, were not content with simple curses. Wherever, and in whatever form, image worship has existed or still exists, believers have at all times vented their wrath upon the images of their gods or saints, when their prayers are unheard and their hopes of assistance unfulfilled. The old Arcadians thrashed their god Pan, when they returned from the chase empty-handed; the Ostiak and the Laplander maltreat their idols and break them to pieces, should misfortune overtake them; the *lazzarone* of Naples kicks the saints with whom he is dissatisfied; the Spaniard throws his *virgen* (image of the Virgin) into the water; the Bavarian peasant flings the wooden image of the Lord on the dung-heap if the hailstorm does not cease. In the south of Italy and Sicily, saints who do not send the longed-for rain in time of drought are frequently bound with cords and thrown into the water. During the Napoleonic campaigns, an old Bavarian battalion made St. Peter run the gauntlet, since he had refused them an easy march. An old Spanish lady of high descent (in 1871) flogged St. Martialis (field-marshal of the Spanish army) with her riding whip on the day when the Carlists were obliged to lay down their arms. These examples show that such excesses are the necessary accompaniments of image worship; and it can only be an accident that only a single instance is recorded of such an outbreak of rage in later antiquity. The manner in which it

is described by Suetonius makes it clear that he saw nothing remarkable in it. When the disquieting reports of the illness of Germanicus were followed by the rumour of his recovery, all the inhabitants, in spite of the lateness of the hour, flocked to the Capitol with lights and sacrificial victims ; the gates of the temple were almost burst open, since the people thought they could not fulfil their vows quickly enough ; on the day of his death, on the other hand, stones were hurled at the temples, altars of the gods thrown down, the domestic *Lares* flung into the streets. In this case, also, we see that the belief in the existence as well as in the power of the gods was such that nothing could shake it.

The extent to which the popular belief, unreflecting and unhesitating, was able to carry out and maintain the identification of the image with the divinity can hardly be determined. What so excited Seneca's indignation, on a chance visit to the Capitol, was partly the antiquated ritual, and partly the childish belief, incomprehensible to him, which saw the divinity himself in the image. And yet the expressions of this belief were hardly more singular or ridiculous than those already mentioned. According to the ancient religious usage, the Capitoline deities were waited upon by different persons ; Jupiter had his lictor, a servant to tell the hours of the day, and another to anoint him. Just as the latter, by waving his arms in the air, represented the operation in dumb show, so the temple attendants of Juno and Minerva moved their hands, as if dressing the goddesses' hair, while others held a mirror in front of them. On the other hand, those ' who called upon the gods to assist them in court, submitted their petitions and laid their case before them ', were evidently suppliants. Seneca also saw women sitting on the Capitol, who (probably in consequence of dreams) believed themselves beloved of Jupiter and awaited his pleasure. These and similar practices, such as the bestowal of offices upon the gods, the clothing of their images in the garb of senators and high officials, the march of the lictors before them with bundles of rods in processions, are not more surprising than their modern parallels. Thus, in Spain, the highest orders are bestowed upon Madonnas ; at Lisbon, on Corpus Christi day, St. George of Cappadocia marches at the head of the Portuguese army accompanied by pages and equerries with led horses ; in Mexico, the holy virgin of Guada-

loupe was appointed field-marshal (with a salary which was paid for fourteen years) of the insurgent army fighting against the Spaniards by its leader Hidalgo; the holy Virgin dos Dolores was raised by Don Carlos to the same rank (in 1834). Thus, like all image worship in its lowest form, that of the period with which we are concerned had assumed the character of gross idolatry. A ceremony, which down to 1864 took place annually in the church of Santa Maria del Carmine in the *Mercato* at Naples was even more singular than the toilettes of the Capitoline goddesses alluded to by Seneca. On the second day of the Christmas festivities, in presence of the authorities and a great crowd of people, the hair and beard of a figure of the Saviour was solemnly cut; this was called *far la barba di Gesú*.

Thus. polytheism was still sufficient for the religious needs of mankind in ancient times, while, in order to satisfy the infinite variety of its tendencies, it split up into a number of forms corresponding to the countless stages of development of the spiritual conscience. However great the contrast between the faith of a Plutarch and a Marcus Aurelius and that of the sailors and peasants who cursed Jupiter during bad weather, all had an equally firm belief in the same gods, in their power and solicitude for mankind. The difference between the most divergent forms of belief at that time was no greater than that which existed in Christianity between the highest and lowest conception of the divine.

II. JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY

The expansive power of Polytheism found its limits in the strict and intolerant exclusiveness of the monotheistic religions, with which agreement was impossible. What polytheists regarded as the highest and holiest was condemned by both Judaism and Christianity as horrible, accursed and soul-destroying. All that is holy amongst us, says Tacitus, is unholy amongst the Jews; what we consider impure is lawful with them. He calls them a people given to superstition, averse from religion. Both Jews and Christians looked upon the gods to whom the heathen prayed as dead idols or evil demons. Greeks and Romans, 'who conceived the divine

fulness of life as a totality, a world, of gods ', were incapable of understanding the belief which removes the divinity, solitary and almost incomprehensibly sublime, to an inaccessible distance, and separates him from adoring humanity by an immense gulf that can never be bridged. The heaven of Judaism and Christianity affected them like ' a cold wilderness ' ; the belief in one god was to them the negation of all that was divine —ungodliness ; Christians and atheists were equally hated by the polytheistic heathens and often coupled together as enemies of religion ; both Christians and Jews were reproached with hatred of the human race.

We are here only concerned with Judaism and Christianity as contrasted with paganism, and in so far as they acted and reacted upon one another. In the endeavour to obtain a general view of the state of religion under the early empire it is indispensable to indicate their position within the world-wide empire of Rome, and the circumstances which essentially favoured or hindered the progress of their doctrines, although only the most salient points can here be touched upon.

The relation of the two monotheistic religions to polytheism was very different. Although both condemned paganism absolutely and without restriction, yet only Christianity was really hostile to it. Judaism, a religion ' admirably fitted for defence, but never designed for conquest ' (Gibbon), preferred isolation to an attempt to propagate its doctrines at the expense of paganism. The Jewish communities, dispersed throughout the empire and yet closely united, certainly had a certain attraction for paganism, but never injured it to such an extent as to imperil its existence ; and in spite of occasional friction and conflicts the relations between Judaism and paganism were in the main peaceful.

The spread of Christianity was from the outset most effectively promoted by the dispersion of the Jews throughout the ancient world. This dispersion had begun early, and even in pre-Christian times had made great progress. In a Sibylline oracle (composed towards the end of the second century B.C.) it is asserted that every land and every sea was full of the Jewish people. Strabo says that ' even in Sulla's time a Jewish element had penetrated into every city, and there is hardly a place in the world which has not admitted this people and is not possessed by it ' ; according to Josephus, there was no

people on earth without a Jewish element. The *Acts of the Apostles* mentions as Jews and akin to Jews, people 'out of every nation under heaven', who heard the apostles speaking with tongues in Jerusalem: Parthians, Medes, Elamites, dwellers in Mesopotamia, Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia, Phrygia, Pamphylia, Egypt, Cyrene, Rome, Crete and Arabia. King Herod Agrippa, in a letter to Caligula, enumerates the countries in which there were Jewish colonies: Egypt, Phoenicia, Syria, Coele-Syria, Pamphylia, Cilicia, most of Asia as far as Bithynia, and the coasts of the inmost bays of the Black Sea; in Europe, Thessaly, Boeotia, Macedonia, Aetolia, Attica, Argos, Corinth, most of the countries (and those the best) of Peloponnesus; of the islands, Euboea, Cyprus, Crete; lastly, the countries beyond the Euphrates, and Libya.

But there is no direct evidence that the Jewish emigration was especially or to any great extent prompted by commercial motives; there is nothing to support this idea, but much to contradict it. The fact that the towns in which Jews are known to have settled were for the most part commercial centres proves nothing, since they offered the most favourable and varied opportunities for every occupation, especially industrial. Further, there is no trace in ancient times of a preference amongst the Jews for the trade which lives on the sale of the work of others; in the sixty-three tractates of the Talmud, which accords an honourable recognition to manual labour and occupation, there is not a word in honour of trade, but many allusions to the dangers of money-making and a wandering life. 'The Jews were always an industrious people. As long as they formed a state agriculture, horticulture and handicraft were their chief occupations. Even in the early centuries of the Christian era and after their dispersion they remained faithful to their old habits; at the beginning of the second century Josephus praises the industry of his compatriots in handicraft and agriculture'. 'In Roman literature and the laws of the emperors there are no indications that the Jews had given themselves up to petty retail trade, or had become a mercantile people at all. Their miserable condition in Rome and the great revolts in Egypt, Cyrene and the Greek islands are arguments to the contrary: a population engaged in trade does not generally have recourse to arms'. How far the

charges (certainly to be received with caution) of avarice, cheating, malice and perfidy, so commonly brought by Christian writers of the fourth and fifth centuries against the Jews, justify us in concluding that they then engaged in commerce to a greater extent than in earlier times, cannot be decided.

Outside the Roman empire, the kingdom of Parthia contained the largest Jewish element. In its Greek towns, of which Seleucia on the Tigris, said to contain 500,000 inhabitants, was the most important commercial centre beyond the Roman frontiers, there were frequent conflicts between the three nations (Greeks, Syrians and Jews) which made up their populations; for example, in the reign of Caligula the Jews were expelled from Seleucia and other cities under the eyes of the Parthian government. They were reckoned by millions in Mesopotamia, Media and Babylonia; Nisibis and Nehardea on the Euphrates were their chief seats, and after the suppression of the last national efforts in Palestine Babylonia became the centre of a new Jewish life, which spread over all parts of the Persian empire. In Palmyra also there were Jews, probably in large numbers; the community which is known to have existed there in the third century A.D. appears to have survived till the middle ages, since Benjamin of Tudela in the twelfth century attests its existence; some pillars and architraves with the inscription 'Hear, O Israel' have been found there. Zenobia and her son Baballath Athenodorus were not ill-disposed to the Jews, as is shown by their confirmation of the right of asylum in a synagogue in lower Egypt (granted by Ptolemy Euergetes I [247–221] or II [146–117]). In Arabia, also, according to the statements of Jewish, Byzantine and Arabian authorities, there are many traces of extensive ramifications of the Jewish movement. The last king of the Jewish Homerites (Himyarites) in south-western Arabia (whose kingdom lasted from 465 to 525 A.D.), Dimnus (Dhu Nowas), was a zealous defender of the faith. Thence Judaism spread to the Aethiopians and Axumites. The formerly independent Jews, who inhabited the island of Iotaba in the Arabian gulf, were subdued by Justinian. The Jewish settlements in Abyssinia appear to be of great antiquity. When Frumentius introduced Christianity there in 315, they are said to have formed half the population.

Within the limits of the Roman empire (Palestine excepted) the Jewish population appears to have been largest in Asia Minor, Phoenicia and Syria. Of the population of Antioch, especially, the Jewish colony settled there by Seleucus Nicator formed a very important contingent, and its chief synagogue is described by Josephus as of remarkable magnificence. As in Alexandria, they enjoyed a certain amount of independence and a privileged position, and the fact that both cities were centres of the Jewish *Diaspora* was an important element in their development. As late as the end of the fourth century, as is proved by the homilies of John Chrysostom against the Jews, their community possessed dangerous powers of attraction for the Christian church. Here they were also visited as physicians. In Damascus 10,000 or 18,000 Jews are said to have been massacred in the Jewish war.

King Antiochus the Great had already transplanted 2,000 Jewish families from Mesopotamia to Asia Minor, which in olden times had been one of the chief seats of the *Diaspora*, to form the nucleus of a brave and trustworthy population for Lydia and Phrygia. One or two of the synagogues of foreign communities in Jerusalem belonged to the Jews from Asia and Cilicia. In Ionia, Ephesus in early times had a numerous Jewish community, which about the middle of the first century B.C. managed to secure various privileges. Inscriptions attest the existence of synagogal communities in Smyrna and Phocaea; the latter honoured the builder (female) of the oratory and surrounding wall of the court of the synagogue with a golden crown and a place of honour. There were also Jewish communities in Caesar's time in Sardes (where they had their own court of justice), in Miletus and Halicarnassus. At Hierapolis in Phrygia payments of fines to the Jewish community for the desecration of graves were instituted, and a certain Publius Aelius Glycon left sums of money to two artisan guilds for the decoration of his grave at Passover and Pentecost. Coins of the reigns of Septimius Severus, Macrinus and Philip, on which Noah is represented in the ark with the raven and the dove with the olive branch, attest the influence of the Jewish community in Apamea (Κιβωτός). In 62 B.C. the praetor, Gnaeus Flaccus, in accordance with his prohibition of the export of gold, publicly sequestered nearly 100 pounds of gold from the tax intended

for the temple at Jerusalem; and this can hardly have been the whole sum. Smaller sums of the same kind were confiscated in Laodicea, Adramyttium and Pergomus. At Acmonia in Phrygia the Jewish community in the time of Nero honoured different persons who had rendered service in building the synagogue—amongst them Julia Severa, a chief priestess of the imperial cult. About the end of the first century, a certain Ptolemaeus erected a burial ground for the Jews at Tlos in Lycia, as a thankoffering for his son having been raised to the dignity of archon in the community. Paul preached in the Jewish schools at Antioch in Pisidia and Iconium in Lycaonia. The Jews were numerous in Cilicia, whose chief town, Tarsus, was the birthplace of the apostle Paul; also in Armenia. In the second century A.D. they are said to have immigrated (from Persia) to China: Mohammedan travellers speak of Jews living there in the ninth century; Marco Polo refers to their influence in China in 1286. According to the statement of a Jesuit in the previous century their descendants remained 'true to their religion, character and customs'; and even at the present day they are not extinct.

Of the Greek islands Crete and Melos (where catacombs of a Christian community of the third century have been found) are mentioned as the residences of well-to-do Jewish populations, who, under Augustus, liberally supported a pretender, who gave himself out to be Alexander, who had been murdered by Herod; the second wife of Josephus was a Jewess from Crete 'of very noble family, whose parents were highly respected in the island'. Caesar permitted religious unions of Jews in Delos and elsewhere; Jews also lived in Cos and Paros. Euboea and Cyprus are mentioned in the letter of Agrippa; in the latter island (where the community of Salamis, in particular, is known from the *Acts*) the Jews were numerous, down to the year 116; but after the atrocities committed during the insurrection, they were forbidden to enter the island again. In Greece and Macedonia, the communities of Athens, Corinth, Thessalonica, Beroea and Philippi are also known from the *Acts*. Two edicts of Arcadius (397) and the younger Theodosius (412), addressed to the prefect of Illyricum (Dacia and Macedonia), ordered that the Jews in the country should not be disturbed nor their synagogues injured. Before Theodosius II., who banished them from Constantinople, their

synagogue was in the place called Chalcoprateia ('copper-ware market'), so called from their workshops. They also spread over the northern shores of the Black Sea at an early date. In the Crimea, two Jewish communities are known from inscriptions: at Panticapaeum (Kertch) about 81 A.D., and at Gorgippia (Anapa) about 41 A.D.; in the slave emancipation acts of these districts (written in Greek) it is made a condition that those emancipated should remain true to Judaism.

According to Philo, the Jewish population of Egypt amounted to 1,000,000, or more than an eighth of the entire population. They were spread over the whole country as far as the frontier of Aethiopia. Alexander the Great had already settled Jews in Alexandria and bestowed the citizenship upon them. After his death they immigrated in large numbers. They were well treated by most of the Ptolemies. In Philo's time they chiefly resided in two of the five regions of Alexandria (in the east of the city), but many lived scattered in the other three; in all parts of the city their synagogues, surrounded by trees, were to be seen; they also had their own synagogue at Jerusalem. The chief synagogue in Alexandria, in the form of a basilica with double peristyle, was so large that an attendant had to give the signal with a flag when the congregation had to respond 'Amen' during the prayers and reading of the Scriptures. The Alexandrian Jews were chiefly engaged in commerce and navigation; some, however, in the mechanical trades. The administration of the system of the Nile dues (*potamophylacia*) was entrusted to them by the Ptolemies and also by the Roman emperors (at least during the first century. A Jewish community at Athribis in the Delta is known from an inscription of the time of the Ptolemies. According to a papyrus document, belonging to the time of the earlier Ptolemies, found in the *nome* of Arsinoë, the modern Fayyûm, in the village of Phenyris a tax had to be paid 'by the Jews and Hellenes', who formed special groups by the side of the natives. In post-Christian times there was a Jewish street in Oxyrhynchus. In the Thebaid receipts for taxes (second century B.C.) have been found, bearing the names of Jewish tax-farmers. The religious centre of the Egyptian Jews was the temple of Onias (160 B.C.) about 40 kilometres from Memphis; the whole district formed (till 73 A.D.) a small hierarchy.

In the district of Cyrene also, where Ptolemy, son of Lagus, had already established a Jewish settlement, there was a numerous Jewish population, to which one of the five synagogues at Jerusalem belonged. A disturbance was put down by Lucullus. Two thousand of them took part in the attempted revolt under Jonathas in 70 A.D. The community of Berenice, according to an extant decree of honour for a certain Marcus Titius, appears to have had nine chiefs (*archontes*) in the year 13 B.C. During the fearful and widespread revolt of the Jews, which broke out in 116 in Cyrene and Egypt, and at the same time in Cyprus and Mesopotamia, 220,000 are said to have lost their lives in the first two, and 240,000 in the last two countries. The coast-town Boreum on the great Syrtis (Syrtis Major) was for the most part inhabited by Jews; it contained a temple, supposed to have been built by King Solomon and regarded as specially sacred, which was converted by Justinian into a church after they had embraced Christianity. In the province of Africa, where the Jewish community of Carthage seems to have been the largest, the mosaic floor of the synagogue of a town called Naron has recently been discovered, together with Latin inscriptions (of a later period) of those who had it laid down. In west Africa traces of a Jewish community at Sitifi in Mauretania, and of Jewish inhabitants elsewhere (especially at Cirta) are preserved.

The statement of Valerius Maximus that in 139 the praetor, Gnaeus Cornelius Hispallus, expelled from Rome and Italy not only the Chaldaeans but also the Jews,' who had attempted to taint Roman usages with the rites of Jupiter Sabazius ', probably refers to the retinue of the ambassadors sent (140–139) by Judas Maccabaeus to Rome. At that time there were clearly no Jews settled in Italy; the identification of the god of the Jews with Sabazius is to be explained by the fact that the Greek Jews pronounced the name Zebaoth as Sabaoth. Eighty or ninety years later, they formed a considerable element of the population. This was due partly to their removal, after the wars of Pompey and Lucullus, as prisoners *en masse* to Rome, where they were soon set at liberty; partly to the development of more intimate and varied relations between east and west. The accusers of the praetor Flaccus (in 59 B.C.) hoped that their numbers, their perfect union and

their influence would make them valuable allies. The whole region beyond the Tiber was chiefly inhabited by them; probably there was also a synagogue there. The ambassadors of Herod, King of the Jews, to Augustus were supposed to have been accompanied by 8,000 of their co-religionists settled in Rome, and in 19 A.D. 4,000 freedmen of an age to bear arms, 'who were infected by Jewish and Egyptian superstition', were condemned to be deported to Sardinia. Nevertheless, in the year 40 Philo speaks of a community of Jews in Rome, and in the reign of Claudius their numbers had so increased that their expulsion, which was considered advisable owing to the disturbances that broke out amongst them, could only be carried out to a very limited extent; at all events, the apostle Paul found a community of them in Rome. The Roman Jews also had a synagogue in Jerusalem. It is clear from inscriptions that they formed a considerable number (at least seven) of individual, independently organized communities. Each had its own synagogue and council of elders, at the head of which was a president (gerusiarch), its managing officials (archons) being elected partly for life, partly for a fixed term; even minors were eligible for this office. Divine service was under the control of chiefs or rulers of the synagogue (ἀρχισυνάγωγοι), assisted by a servant (ὑπηρέτης, hazzan), the 'father' and 'mother of the synagogue' held honorary positions; the scribes (γραμματεῖς) were not regular officials, and children were eligible for the post. The different communities in Rome had burial grounds in common, five of which are known. The inscriptions are mainly in Greek, some written in an almost unintelligible jargon; some are in Latin, none in Hebrew. The use of Hebrew during these centuries was confined to church matters; the general language of the Jewish *diaspora* was Greek, except in Syria, where Aramaic was spoken. The Roman Jews are occasionally mentioned as miserable vagabonds, beggars and soothsayers. The graves and the general condition of the cemetery discovered by Bosio in 1602 (but since lost sight of) were rude and poor; no fragments of marble or painted work were found except the coarsely painted seven-branched chandelier. On the other hand, in a burial ground on the Appian Way paintings (including even figures from heathen mythology) have been found; their meaning, which is still unsolved, is pro-

bably symbolical. There are also traces of an early Jewish settlement in Portus, probably the birthplace of the Peitan (poeta) Eleazar (beginning of the eighth century), the reputed author of liturgical hymns which are still in use at great festivals in Germany, France and Italy.

In the rest of Italy Puteoli seems to have been a chief seat of the Jews, whence they spread over the cities of Campania. The contents of an earthenware vessel at Pompeii is indicated as *gar*(um) *cast*(imoniale), i.e. Kosher fish-sauce (made of fish without scales, in accordance with ' the superstition of the Jews ', says Pliny). A wall inscription in a *triclinium* (dining-room), SODOMA | GOMORA can only have originated with a Jew or a Christian ; a caricature of the judgment of Solomon (perhaps of Alexandrine origin) presupposes acquaintance with Jewish traditions ; the names Maria (in a list of slaves) and Martha occur in wall inscriptions. The existence of a community at Capua is proved by the epitaph of a chief of the synagogue ; at Venusia by the discovery of Jewish catacombs (of the sixth century), containing the epitaph of a chief physician (*archiater*). During the siege of Naples by Belisarius the Jews offered to supply the city with provisions, and at its capture offered an obstinate and unexpected resistance. Jewish epitaphs have also been found at Tarentum and Fundi. In Apulia and Calabria (the coast formation of which is specially alluded to in a *midrash*), the Jews in the fourth century formed so large a part of the inhabitants, that, according to an imperial decree of the year 398, the communal offices in many towns could not be filled, since the Jews maintained that they were not bound to undertake them. In central and northern Italy, where their settlements are probably as old as in the south, traces of them do not occur till late. In Brixia (Brescia) the epitaph of a ' mother of a synagogue ' is proof of the existence of a Jewish community. Theodoric permitted the Jews in Genoa to restore, but not to enlarge their synagogue ; he confirmed the rights of the synagogue in Milan, so far as the church was not prejudiced thereby. While he was in Ravenna, a disturbance broke out between Jews and Christians ; the latter set fire to the synagogues, but were compelled by the king to restore them. In Bononia (Bologna) the martyrs Agricola and Vitalis were buried in a piece of ground belonging to the Jews amongst their graves ; Ambrose had their remains

removed. In Pola also a Jewish epitaph has been preserved; a Roman epitaph mentions Aquileia as the birthplace of a *gerusiarch*. Gregory the Great (who in his letters also mentions the synagogue at Terracina) writes to the bishop of Luna (in Etruria) not to allow any Jew on his property to own Christian slaves. It is also probable that in early times there were large numbers of Jews in Sicily. The rhetorician Caecilius of Calactē (in the reign of Augustus) was probably a freedman of Jewish origin. They are frequently mentioned in the rescripts of the popes referring to the administration of the estates of the church, which extended over the two Sicilies and Sardinia. According to the letters of Gregory the Great, there were Jewish communities in Palermo, Messina and Agrigentum; in 594 he had a list drawn up of all the estates on which Jews resided, so that in the case of those who embraced Christianity he might remit a third of the taxes. The deportation under Tiberius led to the establishment of a permanent Jewish colony in Sardinia; in Cagliari, at least, a Jewish community existed for centuries.

Paul 'intended to visit Spain', which is mentioned in the Mishna and the Talmud, and appears to have carried out his intention; hence it is probable that Jews lived there at that time. Herodes Antipas, who with his wife, Herodias, was banished to Lugdunum by Caligula in 39, was subsequently removed to Spain, where part of his suite may have settled. With this exception, previous to the council of Illiberis (Elvira; probably held between 300 and 309), which definitely mentions the Jews, there is only a single trace of them: an epitaph on a Jewish child in Abdera (Adra) in Baetica, which from the form of the letters appears to belong to the beginning of the third century. About 417 there was a considerable Jewish community in Minorca. Sisebut (612–20) was the first to carry out the extremely severe legislation of the Visigoths against the Jews.

From early times, the Jews are also said to have been connected with Gaul. Archelaus, son of Herod, was banished by Augustus to Vienna (Vienne). Amongst the countries said to have been visited by Rabbi Akiba, in order to induce the Jews to take part in the rising of Bar-cocheba, mention is made of Gaul. Hilary of Poitiers (died 366) avoided the greetings of Jews and heretics in the street. In 331, Constan-

tine issued orders to the *decuriones* (members of the senate in municipal towns and colonies) of Cologne, that the Jews, with two or three exceptions (the clergy and officials of the community), should be compelled to undertake the decurionate. The community of Cologne, whose synagogue is first mentioned in 1012, must consequently have been a fairly large one and of some antiquity. Gratian, Valentinian and Theodosius again deprived the Jews of exemption from the decurionate in 383. They do not seem to be mentioned again by Greek and Roman authorities before Apollinaris Sidonius. In the seventh century King Wamba expelled the Jews from Narbo; yet in the ninth they seem to have formed a very wealthy community, which owned the town mills and much land, employed Christian workmen to cultivate the vine, and carried on trade (chiefly with the Arabs in Spain). It is clear from Gregory of Tours' history of the Franks that they were very numerous throughout Gaul in the sixth century, which justifies the conclusion that their settlements there were of high antiquity. When, for instance, in the year 576 the people of Clermont destroyed their synagogue and Bishop Avitus gave them the choice of emigrating or being baptized, more than 500 embraced Christianity; the rest removed to Marseilles. In 582 King Chilperic caused a number of Jews to be baptized at Paris. When King Guntram entered Orleans in 585, the language of the Jews was heard amongst the acclamations of the throng that welcomed him. The only Jewish inscriptions in the Danube countries are two in lower Pannonia.

In England the Jews appear to have been very numerous during the archiepiscopate of Theodore of Canterbury (669–691); hence they must have been settled there at latest after the middle of the seventh century, probably earlier. For lack of information is no proof of the absence of a Jewish population, but rather (after the early middle ages) of its undisturbed existence. Jerome says that they dwelt 'from sea to sea, from the British to the Atlantic Ocean, from west to south, from north to east, all over the world'. They believed that, should the Messiah lead them back to Jerusalem, those of them who were of senatorial or other high rank would come in carriages from Britain, Spain and Gaul, even from its uttermost limits, from the country of the Morini, from the banks of the Rhine.

After the great Jewish war the tax of two *drachmae*, formerly paid to the temple at Jerusalem, had to be given to the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus; this led to vexatious oppression, especially under Domitian; Nerva treated them more leniently, but did not remit the tax. With this exception, the civil condition of the Jews as such in the Roman empire was not only free from restrictions, but they even enjoyed important privileges. While confirming their fitness to hold offices of state (which at that time was certainly no advantage) Severus and Caracalla expressly exempted them from those which were repugnant to their 'superstition'. Caesar had granted them exemption from military service, a privilege which they must also have enjoyed later. They must have been at least tacitly relieved from participation in the worship of the emperors; if in this and other respects they had the advantage of the Christians, the reason is that they were still looked upon as a nation, the Christians only as a sect. Augustus, who in the main carried on Caesar's policy of friendliness to the Jews, had ordered that they should not be compelled to appear in a court of law on the Sabbath; that when distributions of money and corn in Rome fell on a Sabbath, their share should be distributed to them on the following day; that instead of the oil furnished by the provinces, which they were forbidden to use, a money equivalent should be given to them, a right confirmed to the Jews of Antioch by Vespasian's friend, Mucianus. In addition to the free exercise of their religion, the Jewish communities had the right of administering their own funds, and, to a certain extent at least, jurisdiction over their own members. 'The Jewish ethnarch or patriarch in Palestine, who after the destruction of the Jewish state became the chief of the nation, must have possessed very great authority; the office was hereditary in the family of Hillel. All the Jewish communities of the dispersion appear to have submitted voluntarily to his jurisdiction. And his powers were so extensive that the fathers of the church were obliged to make serious efforts to show that at the time of Christ the sceptre had already been taken from Judah'. For the Jews he was the chief of the state; and thus, in spite of the destruction of Jerusalem, they were in a certain sense reconstituted a nation.

If, in spite of all the rights and privileges conceded to them,

we read in Philo that the Jews had to be content with not being treated worse than others, the remark is to be taken as referring to their social position, which certainly on the whole was very unfavourable. This, of course, was chiefly the case in countries where a strong national hatred of them existed ; or it was the direct result of wars and revolts, in which they had shed streams of blood. Thus, the hatred of the Jew expressed by Pliny the elder, Quintilian and Tacitus is to be attributed to the feelings engendered by the Jewish war. But, apart from the wild fanaticism which raged during these despairing struggles, their haughty contempt for all other nations, civilizations and religions, their avoidance of the society of their neighbours, and the manner in which they persistently kept to themselves, were sufficient to make them ' repugnant to all mankind ' (I *Thessalonians*, ii, 15, ' contrary to all men ', A.V.), and to create the impression that they were a people filled with hatred of humanity. The accusations, exaggerations and fabrications of anti-Jewish writers, chiefly of Egyptian origin, assisted in keeping up the hatred of the Jews, which showed itself in frequent outbursts. According to Tacitus, they taught their proselytes above all to despise the gods, to renounce their fatherland, to disregard parents, children, brothers and sisters. According to Juvenal, Moses taught the Jews not to show any one the way, nor to guide the thirsty traveller to the spring, except he were a Jew. Apion declares that, in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, the Jews every year fattened a Greek, and having solemnly offered him up as a sacrifice on a fixed day in a certain forest, ate his entrails and swore eternal hostility to the Greeks. With hatred of the Jews was associated contempt for their miserable condition, their disgusting uncleanliness, their punctilious observance (ridiculed as superstitious) of so many apparently senseless, absurd and singular laws and customs. Next to circumcision, derision was chiefly aroused by their abstinence from pigs' flesh, which the tumultuous rabble attempted to force them to eat (as in the Jew-baiting at Alexandria described by Philo), by their scrupulous observance of the Sabbath as a day of rest, whereby, says Seneca, they lost a seventh part of their life ; and by the minuteness of the arrangements for avoiding any kind of work on that day. Juvenal mentions the baskets filled with hay, in which the food prepared the

day before was kept warm, as indispensable articles of furniture even in the poorest Jewish households. Rabbi Abahu lamented that jokes about the Jews, however feeble, never failed to cause shouts of laughter in the theatres.

On the other hand, the Jews gained friends, partly by the virtues recognized even by their enemies and praised by Josephus in his defence of them written during the reign of Trajan. These were an unchangeable piety, strict obedience to the law, their few wants, charitableness, perfect harmony amongst themselves, contempt of death in war, diligence in the mechanical occupations and in agriculture in time of peace, an unshakable confidence in God. Thus Judaism, as a truly enlightened religion, attracted many of those who were striving to attain a purer knowledge of God; the rejection of the Greek and Egyptian image worship caused Strabo to regard the Jewish legislator as a true Stoic philosopher. Yet it may be assumed that the number of those was far greater, whose need of belief found fullest satisfaction in Judaism as the only profession of faith which, before the birth and spread of Christianity, offered a dogma depending upon revelation and consequently removed from all doubt; how often was the unshakable conviction that it was the only true religion heroically attested by its professors. All authorities, whether friendly or hostile to the Jews, are agreed that in all lands there were very many who partly or entirely obeyed the Mosaic law; the women especially showed themselves 'guiding stars to faith'. 'The customs of this most infamous people', says Seneca, 'have already gained such influence that they have been introduced into all countries; they, the conquered, have given laws to their conquerors'. Horace, Ovid, Persius and Juvenal testify that at Rome many abstained from any kind of business on the Sabbath and on the day of the new moon; that on the former they never travelled, but prayed, lighted up lamps and hung up garlands; others studied the Mosaic law, attended the synagogues and sent the temple-tax to Jerusalem. 'The great mass of mankind has now for a long time endeavoured to emulate our piety', says Josephus; 'there is no state nor province, Greek or barbarian, to which our custom of resting on the Sabbath has not penetrated, and where our fasts and the lighting up of lamps and abstinence from forbidden food are not observed.

They also attempt to imitate the harmony that prevails amongst us, the charitable distribution of our goods, our diligence in our trades and fortitude in enduring suffering for the sake of the law. But the most wonderful thing of all is, that without the bait of pleasure the law has shown itself strong in itself, and has pervaded all peoples, as God himself has traversed the world'. 'All men', says Philo, 'are in subjection to it; it exhorts them to virtue—barbarians, Hellenes, dwellers on the mainland and on the islands, the nations of both east and west, Europeans, Asiatics, the peoples of the whole earth'. The Alexandrian philosopher thought he might venture to hope that one day Judaism would become the religion of the world.

With the exception of the brief period of persecution under Tiberius, conversion to Judaism met with no legalized opposition till the time of Hadrian; and, except for some temporary attempts at suppression, the Jews continued to enjoy without interference the complete religious freedom guaranteed by Caesar and Augustus. In 42, Claudius issued an edict, 'that the Jews throughout the empire should be allowed to observe their ancient customs unhindered. He also warned them not to abuse his kindness, nor to show contempt for the superstitions of other nations, but to be content with the observance of their own laws'. This edict remained in force till later times. Horace attests that the Jews, on their part, made attempts to convert those who held a different belief; it is well known that the Pharisees in particular 'compassed sea and land to make one proselyte' (*Matt.* xxiii. 15). Yet, after the destruction of Jerusalem, the development of an unbending Rabbinism continually widened the gulf between Judaism and paganism; the Babylonian Talmud calls the proselytes a leprosy for Israel. Antoninus Pius, while allowing the Jews to resume the circumcision of their children, which had been forbidden by Hadrian, most strictly forbade the practice in the case of those who were not Jews; since this edict remained in force, the result was that (with few exceptions) no formal conversions to Judaism took place. The proselytes of this later period were no longer 'proselytes of justice' but only the so-called 'fearers of God' (*φοβούμενοι* or *σεβόμενοι τὸν θεὸν*), who especially observed the Sabbath and abstained from forbidden food. To the latter class the

majority of the converts from paganism to Judaism, even in the times anterior to Hadrian, probably belonged. Further, the influence of Judaism extended beyond the limits of its own followers and led to the formation of semi-Jewish semi-pagan sects. Such were the ' worshippers of the most high god ' (σεβόμενοι θεὸν ὕψιστον) in Tanais in the empire of the Bosporus at the beginning of the third century, and probably the Hypsistarii in Asia Minor, a sect attacked by the Fathers of the Church in the fourth century.

If the very nature of Judaism, as the religion of a chosen people, set limits to its propagation at the expense of paganism, Christianity, on the other hand, had both the inclination and the strength to break through all the obstacles that barred its extension throughout the world. While the Jews regarded the conversion of unbelievers as at the most a meritorious work, for the Christians the spread of the doctrine of salvation was the highest and most sacred duty. The example of the first apostles continually inspired an ever-increasing number of imitators, who, in accordance with the teaching of the gospel, distributed what they had amongst the poor, and set out to carry the word of God from one people to another, and whose zeal never wearied nor abated even in the midst of the greatest dangers and difficulties. ' The Christians ', says Origen, ' were eager to sow the word broadcast throughout the world '. The messengers of the new doctrine visited not only towns, but also villages and farms ; they did not even shrink from making their way into the bosom of the family and interposing between blood-relations. Christian slaves were reproached by pagans with converting their masters' wives and children ; the more zealous even incited children to disobey their fathers and teachers in order to obtain salvation. Thus, as always happens when some great movement shakes the world and fashions it anew, the ties of nature were only too often torn asunder, hearts were broken, and ' love and loyalty uprooted like an evil weed '.

The toleration exceptionally accorded to the Jewish nation as such, which resulted in a tacit release from all obligations that conflicted with their superstition, including the worship of the gods and of the emperors, could not, in the opinion of the Romans, be granted to a sect which had fallen away from

the faith of its fathers, least of all to the Christian. The attitude of the Roman state towards Christianity was one of self-defence. Since the detachment of the new faith from Judaism, which was materially assisted by the destruction of Jerusalem, its tendency, namely, the complete and uncompromising destruction of the state religion, must have become widely known.

The refusal to worship the emperor, which was one of the fundamental institutions of the empire, was an earlier and more frequent cause of the persecutions of the Christians than the refusal to worship the gods. The first which we hear of took place in the province of Asia, in several cities of which (Pergamus, Smyrna, Ephesus) there were temples for this cult, where the yearly gatherings of the festal associations devoted to it took place. ' It appears that the decision as to the attitude which the state subsequently took up in regard to Christianity, was made under Domitian, even if tradition does not allow us to state definitely in what form this decision, which was really authoritative, was embodied ' (C. J. Neumann). The *Revelation of John* (a revision in the reign of Domitian of an older Jewish apocalypse) speaks of the death of the ' faithful martyr ' Antipas and other Christians in Pergamus, ' where Satan dwelleth ', ' that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast neither his image ' (xx. 4).

In accordance with the conception of *majestas* (high treason), refusal to pay homage not only to the emperor as god but also to the national divinities being regarded as an offence against the state, rendered Christians liable to punishment by the criminal law. But only a few emperors and governors until the middle of the third century acted in accordance with this idea. More commonly the extraordinary powers conferred upon the higher authorities (especially provincial governors) for dealing with religious offences, were brought into operation against both proselytes and proselytizers, in order to prevent or at least to check the apostasy of citizens from the national belief. This method of procedure, not forming part of the regular administration of justice and therefore of necessity arbitrary, was in its nature ' dependent upon the individuality of the official and upon the varying mood of the people ;

hence the prevalence of ' an instability, such as is in no way perceptible in other respects in the administration of justice even during this period of decay '.

But the state of public feeling was from the outset hostile to the Christians, and became more so as time went on. They were despised by the educated classes for their humility, their ignorance, their contempt for art and science and everything which refined and adorned life, for their lack of patriotism and their indifference to the most vital interests of state. The masses hated them. Their aloofness from the society of those who were not Christians, the steadfastness with which they clung together, their aversion from all festivities which had anything to do with the cults of paganism, the strictness of their life, which implied censure of any kind of laxity, their threats of eternal damnation for unbelievers, and, generally speaking, everything which served to accentuate the opposition of Christianity to the world—these were alone sufficient to bring upon them the reproach of ' hatred of the human race '. But their ' atheism ' made them hated to an even greater degree ; their hostility to the national religion, their mockery of what millions held sacred, their abuse of the gods, who for centuries had protected the Roman state and raised it to such greatness, to whose favour every man was indebted for everything that made life worth living. As time went on the adherents of the ancient faith showed an increasing inclination to attribute all public and general misfortune to the wrath of the gods at the decline of their worship, and to hold Christianity and its professors responsible for this wrath. ' Most of the sentences of death pronounced upon martyrs before the reign of Decius, as in the case of the founder of the religion, were due to the blind fanaticism of the masses and the weakness of the governors '. ' If the Tiber has left its bed ', says a Christian author, ' if the Nile has not poured its waters over the fields, if the sky gives no rain, if there is an earthquake, if famine or pestilence threatens, the cry immediately arises, *To the lions with the Christians !* ' The aged bishop Pothinus ended his life as a martyr at Lyons in the year 177, brutally treated by the mob. ' All thought it would be a grievous crime and an act of impiety not to take part in this wanton violence, for which their gods would punish them '. In course of time the idea gained ground that the entrance of Chris-

tianity into the world was the beginning of a general decay of the human race.

The general and persistent belief in the horrible crimes falsely imputed to the Christians, held not only by the masses but also by the most highly educated, is the surest symptom of the intense and passionate hatred with which the Christians were regarded. No doubt the secrecy of their worship also contributed to this belief. From time immemorial secret religious meetings have aroused the suspicion amongst outsiders, that things take place under the cloak of religion which cannot bear the light. In the old Roman world the impression caused by the great *Bacchanalia* process (185 B.C.) lasted for centuries. At that time a secret worship of Bacchus that had made its way into Rome through Etruria was used as a cloak for the most outrageous excesses and the most abominable crimes; the result of the investigation instituted by the senate was the punishment (chiefly by death) of thousands who had taken part in these orgies. The charges of 'Oedipodean connexions and Thyestean banquets' (i.e. unnatural excesses and ritual murder) were revived against the Christians. Appeal was made to confessions wrung from slaves, women and children under torture, and also to the mutual accusations of Christian parties and sects, who, as a pagan writer observes, accused each other of the most shameful and unmentionable crimes. It may be mentioned that Hippolytus, who claimed the papacy in opposition to Callistus (215–22),[1] in his *Refutation of all Heresies*, reproaches the latter with having taught adultery and murder. Thus belief in the disgraceful orgies and ritual murders of the Christians continually received fresh support; Tacitus had both in mind when he wrote (at the beginning of the reign of Hadrian) that the pernicious superstition of the Christians, which was suppressed by the crucifixion of their founder in Judaea, had broken out anew in Rome, 'the meeting-place of all that is horrible and shameful (*cuncta atrocia aut pudenda*), which finds ready acceptance there'. That Pliny also conducted his inquiry in a similar spirit is clear from the declaration of the Christians (reported by him to Trajan), that they had met together for a 'harmless' meal. As late as the year 200 it was affirmed and believed

[1] Hippolytus is said to have been the 'anti-pope', as such claimants were called.

that at their initiatory ceremonies a child was sacrificed and eaten with bread dipped in its blood; that dogs were tied to the candlesticks, which they pulled down when something to eat was thrown to them; and that the most disgraceful acts were then committed under cover of the darkness.

This mob-frenzy was the chief cause of the so-called persecution of the Christians under Nero. To divert from himself the suspicion of having been the originator of the great fire (July, 64), Nero abandoned 'the Christians, hated for their deeds of shame', to the fury of the people, which clamoured for victims. Those who avowed themselves Christians were seized first [1]; then, on their information, an immense number of others. If not convicted of incendiarism, they were put to death on the charge of 'their general hatred of the human race' with such fearful tortures that they aroused compassion, 'although they were guilty and deserved the severest punishment' (Tacitus). Wrapped in the skins of wild beasts, they were torn to pieces by dogs or nailed to the cross; others were set on fire, that the flames might serve to light up the night.[2] The imperial gardens in which 'Nero's torches' illumined the darkness were in the neighbourhood of St. Peter's Church.

The first general instructions known to us for dealing with the Christian question were drawn up by Trajan in his rescript to the younger Pliny. The latter, when governor of Bithynia and Pontus about the year 112, alarmed at the spread of the new 'superstition', asked for advice, since he had never been present at any judicial proceedings against the Christians. Trajan decided that all who were accused and convicted of being Christians should be punished; but that any one who recanted and confirmed his renunciation by offering sacrifice to the gods should be pardoned without regard to the past. They were not to be hunted out; the emperor also disapproved of any notice being taken of anonymous denunciations. Hadrian was the only emperor who allowed the Christians to practise their religion; he issued orders in a decree to the governor of Asia that the Christians might only be called to account if charged with a non-religious crime, and that in

[1] Rather 'were first brought to trial'.
[2] Their bodies were smeared with some combustible material, which made them burn ke torches.

such a case no mercy should be shown to the false accuser. In general, however, the emperors held to the policy of intervention on information received, and punished when it was unavoidable. The legal position of the Christians was thus always uncertain.

Under Marcus Aurelius their condition became worse. A rescript issued by him about 177, ordering the punishment of such as helped 'to disturb the easily excited minds of the masses by false belief', was taken to refer to the Christians. In different provinces the wrath of the population of the towns burst out against them. We possess the highly interesting report of the communities of Vienne and Lyons to the brethren in Asia and Phrygia on the persecution in the latter town (of which Pothinus the bishop was one of the victims). In Lyons the condemned Christians who were citizens were beheaded, non-citizens were thrown to the wild beasts. Contrary to Trajan's decree, the governors had the Christians hunted out, and according to a contemporary this was a general or at least a frequent practice.

It is easy to understand the reason for a fanatical hatred of the Christians at that time. Never before had the empire been visited by so many dire misfortunes. In 166 German tribes, driven on by the pressure of the nations behind them, had crossed the Danube, overran and devastated the north-east frontier provinces from east Switzerland as far as Hungary and Transylvania, and carried away hundreds of thousands of prisoners; some of their hordes had even penetrated to Italy and Greece. For the first time the empire was out of joint. The severe and costly wars, in which the Romans strained every nerve, lasted nine years before the enemy was finally overpowered. At the same time, since 162 a fearful epidemic, brought in from the east, had penetrated as far as the Rhine and Gaul, devastated the camps of the legions and changed whole tracts of land into deserts. In addition, bad harvests and famine aggravated the sufferings of the people to the utmost. Then, if ever, it seemed reasonable to believe that the gods had withdrawn their favour from the empire they had so long visibly protected; and what more likely to have caused their wrath than the increasing apostasy from the national faith, brought about by the false doctrines of the 'atheists', who shunned the light and were filled with hatred

of mankind? Marcus Aurelius himself must have shared this opinion to some extent. He was not only very devout, but a man of strong faith. He declared that he would not care to live in a world without gods, and he seems to have regarded the gods of all nations as equally powerful and equally deserving of reverence.

Finally, it must be remembered that at that time amongst the Christians themselves a visionary tendency had appeared, which obstinately challenged and resisted the state authority. It was most pronounced in the sect called Montanists, whose founder Montanus in Asia Minor (about 156) claimed to be the paraclete. The Montanists, whose views also spread to the western church, demanded the strictest asceticism and unconditional renunciation of everything earthly, announced the imminence of the end of the world and of the establishment of the millennium, attached excessive value to martyrdom and encouraged men to suffer for their belief. This longing for a martyr's death, disapproved of by moderate-minded Christians, only aroused the scorn and ridicule of the heathen, who advised them to kill themselves to save other people the trouble. When the proconsul Gaius Arrius Antoninus (184–5) vehemently persecuted the Christians in his province of Asia, they crowded before his tribunal (at least in Ephesus) and voluntarily offered their lives. Some of them he ordered to be led away to execution, but dismissed the rest with the words: 'Miserable creatures, if you want to die there are ropes and precipices!' The courage shown by the Christian martyrs in face of death impressed Marcus Aurelius with the idea that it was the result of pride and obstinacy, not of reasoned conviction.

The persecution of that date also demanded victims in Africa, where hitherto no Christian blood had been shed. We possess the protocol of the proceedings taken against three Christian men and women of Scili in Numidia by the proconsul of Africa (July 17, 180). Notwithstanding his obvious efforts to facilitate their return to paganism, the accused persisted in their profession of faith, refused to swear by the *Genius* of the emperor and to offer sacrifice for his safety (although this did not even involve a recognition of his divinity), and declined the offer of thirty days for consideration. They were beheaded on the same day; a *basilica* was sub-

sequently erected over their grave. In Rome itself at that time or a little later the Christians were condemned to forced labour in the Sardinian mines; they owed their liberation (about the year 190) to Marcia, the mistress of Commodus. Work in the mines was the severest punishment next to the death penalty; those condemned to it were thereby degraded to the rank of slaves, one side of their head was shaven, they worked in chains, and were liable to corporal chastisement.

Although during the years immediately after the death of Marcus Aurelius the persecution of the Christians still went on, their lot was a happier one, chiefly owing to the influence of Marcia. For nearly seventy years they remained unmolested except during the persecutions under Septimius Severus and the Thracian Maximin. The stories of ritual murders and shameless orgies gradually died out, as Christianity emerged more boldly from its retirement and Christians and pagans came into contact (even through marriage and family relations). A proof of the diminishing hatred of the Christians is that the millenary secular festival of the city of Rome, which was celebrated (in 248) with the greatest solemnity for three days and nights and undoubtedly called forth a great increase of religious feeling, concluded without any hostile demonstrations against the Christians.

If the number of martyrs up to this time was by no means inconsiderable in itself, it cannot be considered large in proportion to the size of the empire and the period of two hundred years during which they met their death (not reckoning the victims of the Neronian persecution, who cannot properly be called martyrs). This is expressly confirmed by Origen, the most learned Christian writer of the period before Constantine, in a treatise written in 248. He says: 'Only a few, whose numbers can easily be counted, have suffered death from time to time for the sake of the faith, and to encourage the rest'. His evidence is the more weighty, since his personal experiences might rather have led him to exaggerate the extent and terrible nature of the persecutions. He himself had survived two of them, and in the first had suffered most cruel treatment. His father, Leonidas, had been condemned (in 202) in Alexandria to death by the sword as a Christian; he himself, before he was seventeen years of age, longed so violently for a martyr's death that his mother was obliged to

hide his clothes to prevent him leaving the house. When his father was in prison he wrote him an impressive letter on martyrdom, in which he exhorted him not to consider his family: 'See to it that thou dost not change thy opinion for our sakes!'

During the persecution under Maximin the Thracian he issued an *Exhortation to Martyrdom*, in which he most earnestly exhorts them not to sully themselves by a single word, even under threats of death or on the rack. The evidence of Origen as to the small number of martyrs down to the middle of the third century is confirmed (if confirmation were needed) in the passionate *De Mortibus Persecutorum* ('On the Deaths of the Persecutors'), written by Lactantius in 313–4. In this essay Decius (249–51) is made to follow directly upon Nero and Domitian. Lactantius states that the good emperors who succeeded Domitian had not shown themselves hostile to the church, and the fact that he passes over in silence the sufferings and oppressions of the Christians during the period between Domitian and Decius shows that they cannot have left a very deep impression. But even the persecution of Diocletian cannot be compared with the deeds of the Duke of Alva in the Netherlands, where the number of those who suffered death under Charles V for the sake of their faith is estimated by Fra Paolo at 50,000, by Hugo Grotius at 100,000.

Further, it is well known that the religious and missionary zeal of the Christians was rather inflamed than quenched by the persecutions. 'The spread of our doctrine', says Clement of Alexandria, 'since its first proclamation has been hindered by kings and rulers, by governors and administrators of provinces, who all oppose us with all their hired soldiers and a vast multitude of others, seeking as far as possible to exterminate us. And yet it flourishes more and more. It does not perish like a doctrine invented by man; it does not wither like a fragile gift, for no gift that comes from God is fragile. It abides and cannot be hindered in its progress, although it is prophesied that it shall be persecuted to the end'.

Yet in spite of the most glowing missionary zeal, the sublime doctrine of the gospel, too sublime for a great, if not the greatest, part of the heathen world, could never have made such relatively speedy progress without the co-operation of other causes, which had their origin partly in the needs and

weaknesses of human nature in general, partly in the social conditions of the age.

The new doctrine appealed to all mankind; the promise of salvation was open to all, even the lowest and the most despised. Naturally it found the most favourable soil in the vast multitude of 'the weary and heavy-laden', the poor and unfortunate. It brought the most joyful message for slaves; it announced to them their elevation from lowliness, contempt and a position outside the pale of the law to an equality with those who were free. It must have spread with the greatest rapidity amongst this class, and certainly penetrated often enough from the cell of the slave to the house of the master. But above all it afforded unexpected consolation to the despairing and faint-hearted; it opened a prospect of forgiveness even to the guiltiest. The heathen scoffed at the idea that, while only those who felt themselves free from guilt were invited to other ceremonies of consecration, the Christians promised that the Kingdom of God would admit both sinners and fools—in other words, the unfortunate. In these circumstances the language in which the gospel was proclaimed could only be that of the lower classes. Neither the Greek in which the books of the New Testament are written, nor the Latin in which it first became known to the West, is the written or learned language, but 'the everyday language of the home and family, of the market and the streets, of the workshops, of the country, of the camp'.

The fact that women were very impressionable to the new doctrine also exercised a very considerable influence upon its propagation. Christianity elevated women in the Greek countries, where they held a very inferior position, to the equals and companions of man; it bestowed upon marriage a new consecration through the more intimate spiritual communion of one and the same belief and hope; upon virginity a new sanctity; upon the whole life of woman a higher social value. Women, however, did not always keep within the limits of their position as defined for them in the Christian community. Paul had to censure them for praying and prophesying in Corinth with head uncovered; he was obliged to admonish them to keep silence in the churches, and to submit themselves to their husbands in accordance with the law.

But what gained the greatest number of converts to Chris-

tianity was the very same thing that made Judaism, with all its exclusiveness, so attractive: the satisfaction of the requirements of belief, sought in vain within the limits of paganism, which only a dogma depending upon revelation and thus completely beyond the reach of scepticism could afford. And further, the mysterious nature of this dogma corresponded in the highest degree 'to the propensity of the human mind, most readily to believe what is secret' (Tacitus). But perhaps nothing so irresistibly impressed men's minds as the promise, never before proclaimed with such unassailable conviction, of a better life beyond the grave, of eternal bliss. In conjunction with this hope of happiness, the fear of the eternal punishments which threatened unbelievers exercised an even more powerful effect, since a belief in the imminence of the millennium was very general amongst the Christians until the middle of the second century.

'Signs and wonders' also, after which believers hankered no less than sceptics and waverers, were of frequent occurrence, and served to confirm both the Christian and the pagan faith. In the name of Jesus, says Irenaeus (Bishop of Lyons 177–202), his disciples, who have received the gift from him, cast out devils; others have foreknowledge of and predict the future; others heal the sick by laying on of hands, and bring back the dead to life. It is impossible to number the gifts which the church has received from God for the whole world, and in the name of Jesus Christ crucified under Pontius Pilate exercises for the benefit of the nations, neither deceiving any nor accepting payment; for as she hath freely received of God, so also she freely ministers (partly from Keble's translation). Arnobius, who (like most people) regarded the miracles performed by Christ as a proof of his divine nature, in repudiating the assertion of pagans that he was a magician, laid special stress on the fact that he was able to heal the sick and bring back the dead to life by his word alone and by the laying on of hands; whereas the heathen gods only prescribed remedies, like physicians, and in thousands of cases were utterly unable to assist the sick. Similarly, Origen asserts that he has seen sick men, 'whom neither men nor demons were able to heal', freed from their sufferings by the simple invocation of God and Jesus. Augustine relates numerous miracles which he had seen himself, including no less than five cases of raising

the dead, and especially many wonderful cures which had taken place near the sepulchral chapels of St. Stephen at Calama and Hippo Regius; there were no less than seventy written accounts of the miracles wrought near the latter building, which had not yet been built two years. As was later the case in the Germanic north, countless adherents were gained for the new faith by the conviction 'that the god of the Christians was more willing to help than the gods of the heathen, and above all had greater power'. At a horse race in Gaza, in which the horses of a zealous Christian and a zealous heathen took part, 'Christus beat Marnas'; the result was that many of the heathen were baptized. A poem by the rhetorician Endelechius (fourth or fifth century) most naïvely admits that conversion to Christianity commended itself by the advantages which the god of the Christians bestows upon those who profess it. Bucolus has lost his flocks by a cattle plague, while those of Tityrus have been spared. 'What god', asks the former, 'has preserved you from this misfortune?' and Tityrus replies, 'The sign of the cross, painted on the animals' foreheads, has kept them safe; if you wish to obtain the assistance of the true god, it is sufficient to believe'. 'If this is really so', says Bucolus, 'I will hasten to adopt the true faith and to flee from error'. Aegon, who is present during the dialogue, is ready to do the same, 'for why should I doubt that the same sign that overcomes sickness will also be ever beneficial to men?' Augustine's account of the conversion of the chief physician (*archiater*) Dioscorus gives a specimen of the marvellous punishments inflicted upon those who obstinately refused to be converted. Dioscorus, who had been in the habit of scoffing at the Christians, during his daughter's illness implored the mercy of Christ, and vowed to become a Christian if she recovered. His daughter was restored to health, but Dioscorus, who hesitated to fulfil his vow, became blind; on his repeating it, his sight was restored; when he again hesitated to make confession of Christianity all his limbs became paralysed, and in addition he was struck dumb. When at last he expressed his willingness to declare himself a Christian, the visitation ceased.

Then the faith of the Christians, firm as a rock and so often heroically attested, filled men's minds with respect for a re-

ligion which had such followers. 'The more we are mown down', says Tertullian, 'the more our number increases. The blood of the Christians is seed. That stubborn obstinacy with which you reproach us becomes a source of instruction. For who is not profoundly affected by the contemplation of it, and incited to inquire what is really at the bottom of it? Who does not embrace our religion when he has finished his inquiry? and who, when he has embraced it, does not desire to suffer himself?' The morality of the Christians extorted the admiration even of their opponents. On the occasion of the inquiry, which in his capacity as governor of Bithynia he felt himself obliged to hold in regard to the Christians (especially in Amisus), Pliny shared the general prejudice, which accused them of shameful deeds at their secret meetings; but after a strict investigation, at which two female slaves were tortured, he could find nothing to accuse them of, except a 'perverse and extravagant superstition'. The accused declared to him that their sole offence or error consisted in the fact that they were in the habit of assembling before sunrise on a certain day, and offering up prayer to Christ as to a god; and that they vowed never to be guilty of theft, robbery or adultery, never to break their word, never to deny that a deposit had been entrusted to them. After this they separated and assembled together again at a harmless meal. Galen was of opinion that the faith of the Christians taught them to act in accordance with the precepts of true philosophy; he especially recognized their contempt of death, their chaste, modest, abstemious, and strictly moral life; and held that some of them were not inferior to true philosophers in their self-control and earnest endeavour to attain virtue.

But the Christian communities certainly contained some impure elements; not all the sinners, whom they admitted in the hope of reformation, were really reformed. This is proved by the reproaches addressed by Paul and an author speaking in his name to the communities at Corinth and Crete, as well as by the fact that 'James found himself obliged to censure the moral abuse of the Pauline doctrine relative to the power of faith, as that which alone brings salvation, and that the *Revelation* had to denounce certain tempters in Pergamus (the Nicolaitans), who not only did not observe the regulations as to food enjoined upon gentile Christians, but even paid no

regard to the prohibition of lewdness'. In fact, it was just this active charity and compassion, shown by the Christians to one another, that was abused by hypocrites, who joined the new community in the hope of assistance and other advantages, especially as in course of time exaggerated rumours of the wealth of the Christian communities penetrated the heathen world. It was declared that 'the brethren' sold their goods and offered the proceeds to the church; that they regarded it as the height of piety to strip their own children in order to enrich the church. Already Paul speaks of wandering Christians, who live upon ('devour') the foreign communities and rob them of their property, and he himself was obliged to vindicate himself before the Corinthians from the reproach of intentional fraud. In the *Teaching of the Apostles*, written about the time of Hadrian, travelling missionaries are instructed not to remain more than two days at most in the same place: 'but if he abide three days, he is a false prophet. And when he departeth let the apostle receive nothing save bread, until he findeth shelter; but if he ask money, he is a false prophet. . . . Yet not every one that speaketh in the spirit is a prophet, but only if he have the ways of the Lord' (Lightfoot's translation). From an anti-Christian standpoint, Lucian has described the sympathy shown to the philosopher Peregrinus Proteus by the Christians of Palestine, when he was cast into prison for having declared his conversion to their faith. After they had done their utmost (but in vain) to secure his release, they sought in every way to alleviate the hardships of his imprisonment. At daybreak old women, widows and orphans gathered round the prison gates. The heads of the community, by bribing the guards, even obtained permission to pass the night in the prison. Food in abundance was taken in, and prayers were offered up at meals. Envoys arrived even from the communities of Asia Minor, to offer consolation, advice and assistance; for in such cases, says Lucian, they show themselves incredibly generous, and give all they possess without hesitation. In this manner Peregrinus secured much money, and his imprisonment was the source of a considerable income to him. For the unfortunate, Lucian proceeds, imagine that an eternal life will be theirs; hence they attach little importance to life on earth and the good things of this world; further, their first lawgiver has

taught them that they are all brothers one of another, from the moment when they have rejected the Hellenic gods and begin to worship their crucified sage and to live in accordance with his laws. Wherefore they despise all earthly blessings alike and regard them as common to all, having adopted these theories without any sort of warranty. If a clever impostor worms his way into their confidence it is easy for him to make fools of these simple people, and to amass wealth in a very short time. Tertullian also censures the excessive attention of the communities to the bodily necessities of those imprisoned for the faith, and Ambrose seriously warns the priests against lavishing their gifts upon unworthy persons, who solicit their assistance under various false pretences.

There is no doubt that false prophets of every kind, impostors as well as enthusiasts and fanatics, found a specially favourable soil in the Christian communities for the propagation of their false doctrines, and thereby acquired influence and reputation. It is equally certain that ambitious men, whose humble position or other disadvantages prevented them from attaining their aims, attempted to play a part in this society which was denied them in political life. From the beginning sectarianism was rife amongst the Christian communities ; the church persecuted the sects, and the sects each other, with bitter hatred and passionate accusations, hardly surpassed in violence by the charges brought against the Christians generally by the heathen. Celsus affirmed that the Christians were so split up that they had scarcely anything in common except the name.

The *Refutation of all Heresies* (see p. 189) composed not long before 235 by Hippolytus, a man with strong leanings towards the rigourism of the Montanists, gives an extremely interesting summary of the divisions and antagonisms in the bosom of the Christian communities, chiefly due to differences of opinion in regard to doctrine, and also of the difficulties and discomforts which sometimes resulted from the contact of the Christian with the pagan world. Hippolytus' attack on the head of the Christian community at Rome shows only too clearly what ugly passions were aroused and fostered at that time by religious controversies in the Christian world. His account, which is in many respects characteristic, is in the main as follows.

Callistus was a Christian slave belonging to a freedman named Carpophorus, an official in the palace of the Emperor Commodus, who was also a Christian. Carpophorus entrusted a considerable sum to Callistus, with which he was to found a banking business, the profits of which were to be his, although it was carried on under his master's name. Many widows and brethren deposited their money in it. But Callistus, whose mismanagement had brought him to the verge of bankruptcy, in order to escape rendering an account, fled to the harbour of Portus and took refuge on board a ship just ready to sail. Carpophorus followed him. When Callistus saw his master in the port he sprang into the sea, but was pulled out, taken back to Rome, and sent by Carpophorus to the treadmill (a common punishment of slaves). However, Carpophorus was persuaded to release him, when several of the brethren who were interested in the bank represented to him, with tears in their eyes, that their confidence in him had induced them to entrust their money to Callistus, and that the latter had assured them that he still had a certain sum safely invested. But Callistus, finding himself still unable to meet his engagements, attempted to put an end to his life and at the same time to win the glory of martyrdom. Under pretence of collecting a debt, he made his way into a synagogue on the Sabbath and disturbed the service. The Jews fell upon him and dragged him before the tribunal of the city praefect Fuscianus, who ordered him to be flogged and condemned him to hard labour in the Sardinian mines (the lead mines near Las Antas in the south-west of the island), where there were many other Christians who had been condemned on account of their faith. But Marcia, Commodus' mistress, desirous of performing a good work, ordered bishop Victor (198–9) to give her a list of the martyrs in the island, and secured their release. Callistus, whose name Victor had purposely omitted, persuaded the eunuch Hyacinthus, the bearer of the letter of emancipation, who was Marcia's foster-father and at that time a presbyter in the community, to procure his release from the governor of Sardinia. Victor was greatly displeased, but confined himself to ordering Callistus to take up his abode at Antium, and settled on him a monthly allowance for food. These events took place between 186 and 190.

Zephyrinus (199–217), the successor of Victor, was accord-

ing to Hippolytus a simple, ignorant man, who knew nothing of theological doctrines, but was avaricious and open to bribes. Callistus so ingratiated himself with him that Zephyrinus summoned him to Rome, and appointed him overseer of the great cemetery recently founded by him. Callistus succeeded in making each of the rival parties in the community believe that he was on its side, and in this manner got himself elected bishop. In this capacity he came forward with a false and pernicious doctrine : he asserted the unity of the Father and the Son, founded a school of theology, and promised forgiveness of sins to all who should join it. Many, whose conscience smote them, including those whom Hippolytus had expelled from the community in accordance with the condemnatory sentence, joined this school. Callistus taught that a bishop ought not to be deposed even for a deadly sin ; he appointed bishops, priests and deacons who had been twice and thrice married ; and allowed married clergy to continue in holy orders. The saying, ' Suffer the tares to grow together with the wheat ', he interpreted to mean that sinners should be allowed to remain in the church, whose symbol was the ark of Noah, which contained clean and unclean animals. He showed himself culpably indulgent, especially to women of rank, whom he permitted to live with slaves or men of inferior status, with whom they could not contract a valid marriage without losing their rank. Their repugnance to rearing the children of such marriages led these women to fresh crimes. Thus this impious wretch taught both adultery and murder. During his episcopate also, for the first time, second baptism was attempted by his followers.

There can be no doubt of the substantial truth of the facts here alleged, but it is equally clear that they are collected, explained, and commented upon in a most hostile manner. We shall not discuss how far the doctrine of Callistus, his exercise of spiritual discipline and his ' legitimization of average morality ', admit of a more favourable judgment. But the account given by Hippolytus makes it incomprehensible how he could have been chosen as its head by the community which knew him as a common criminal. Nothing is said of his entry into orders, and probably many other things are omitted which might possibly make such an elevation intelligible, after such a past. Callistus appears to

have become deacon of Pope Zephyrinus; as such he administered the funds of the community, paid the salaries of the ministers of the church, and distributed alms to widows and orphans. In such a position it must have been difficult for him to avoid causing dissatisfaction; but he would hardly have been elected bishop had not his (eighteen years) administration been in the main beyond reproach.

A venerable foundation, of great importance for the history of the primitive Christian church, and at the same time the subject of one of the most brilliant archaeological discoveries, is inseparably connected with the name of Callistus. The burial place laid out by him near the Appian way on the property of the Caecilii was to all appearance the first cemetery of the Christian community at Rome recognized by the state; hitherto burials had taken place on land belonging to individual members, upon whose title of possession the preservation of these burying places depended. This cemetery, ever since called the Cemetery of Callistus, which was the last resting-place of the popes down to Miltiades (died 314) was re-discovered during the nineteenth century by the indefatigable genius and successful exploration of De Rossi.

The narrative of Hippolytus reminds us of what is sometimes forgotten: that the Christian communities could not possibly separate themselves entirely from the world, but that, on the contrary, they were continually called upon to bear their share of the evils and inconveniences of the civilization of the period. It is, of course, only natural that the apologists of the new faith should see only love and harmony in the one, and hatred and mutual persecution in the other. Compare, says Origen, the Christian communities of Athens, Corinth and Alexandria with the pagan communities of the same cities; the former are meek and peaceful, since their desire is to please God; the latter, who in no way resemble them, are given to sedition. Even the heads and elders of the communities of God, even the more indolent and less perfect among them, will be found to have made more progress towards virtue than the heads and councillors in the various cities. Yet we can hardly believe that the congregation of Corinth had completely changed since the time when Paul spoke so ill of it. At that time 'debates, envyings, wraths, strifes, backbitings, whisperings, swellings, tumults' (2 Cor.

xii. 20)—in short, irregularities of every kind—were rife in their assemblies; and the object of the letter of the so-called Clement of Rome, written towards the end of the first century, is to heal a schism that had arisen amongst them. The writer declares that it is a disgrace to this old and trustworthy community, to resist their elders for the sake of one or two persons. According to the *Shepherd of Hermas* (composed about the middle of the second century), the Roman community at that time also suffered from various moral evils and infirmities. There was no lack of quarrels and enmities, and the writer utters a warning against ambition, arrogance, avarice, adultery, drunkenness and so forth. Bishop Cyprian of Carthage, who suffered martyrdom in 257, says that the persecution (under Decius, which he had escaped by flight) was rather a test instituted by God; the Christians had deserved to suffer more on account of their sins; the long days of peace had undermined moral discipline. Amongst the priests there was no piety, amongst the ministers no sincere faith, no mercy in their works, no moral discipline. Men disfigured their beards by art, women rouged their faces, painted their eyes, dyed their hair. He further complains of insatiable avarice, of cunning frauds to deceive the simple, of snares to dupe the brethren, of marriages with unbelievers, of oaths rashly taken and of perjury, of haughty contempt of those set over them, of envenomed insults, of quarrels and obstinate hatred of one another. Many bishops, neglecting their sacred office, became agents (procurators) of secular masters, abandoned their communities, and wandered over foreign provinces in search of gain. While brethren in the community were starving, they went in pursuit of money, seized estates by fraud, and increased their incomes by usury. John Chrysostom says that, since miracles no longer happen, the heathen can only be converted by the example of Christian life; but this is utterly corrupt, and there is not even a trace of love to be found amongst them. In Augustine, the heathen replies to the Christian who attempts to convert him: 'How can you exhort me to become a Christian? A Christian cheated me, and I have never acted so; a Christian has sworn falsely to me, and I have never acted so'. Extreme outbreaks of dissent were certainly repressed during the early centuries by the persecutions that

weighed heavily on the whole Christian world; later (367), when ecclesiastical disputes at Rome were settled by bloodshed, a kindly and intelligent heathen could express the opinion that no wild animal was as hostile and destructive to man as most of the Christians to one another.

However numerous the causes that contributed to the spread of the Gospel, it is certain that before the middle or end of the second century it had only a few isolated followers amongst the upper classes. Not only did their philosophical training, and a general education intimately connected with polytheism, offer the strongest resistance, but, in addition, the Christian profession of faith led to the most dangerous conflicts with the existing order of things; and lastly, the renunciation of all earthly interests was naturally most difficult for those who possessed honour, wealth and influence. The poor and lowly, says Lactantius, are more ready to believe than the rich, whose hostility was no doubt in many ways aroused against the socialistic tendencies of Christianity. On the other hand, in the lower strata of society the spread of Christianity, assisted to a remarkable extent by the dispersion of the Jews, must have been very rapid, especially in Rome; as early as the year 64 the number of Christians there was considerable. The architectural arrangements and the style of the artistic decoration of some of the Christian catacombs in Rome seem to show that they belong to the first century.

In the second century Christianity made far greater progress. The general defection from the popular religion in Bithynia, which emptied the temples and alarmed the younger Pliny, can have been no isolated phenomenon, at least in the eastern provinces. The existence of Christian communities, founded from Asia Minor, in Vienne and Lyons in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, justifies the assumption that the seed of Christianity had sprung up comparatively early also in the centres of civilization in the West. In the second half of this century Christian writers already spoke in very boastful terms of the spread of Christianity. There is no race of men, says Justin (died 166), barbarians, Greeks or whatever they may be called, whether they lead a wandering life in wagons or in tents without any fixed habitation, which does not offer prayer and thanks to the father and creator of the universe

in the name of the crucified Jesus. Irenaeus (bishop of Lyons 177–202) speaks of Christian communities in Germany, Iberia, Gaul, in the East, Egypt and Libya, and in the centre of the world (Rome). The author of a treatise ascribed to Tertullian uses still more high-flown and even threatening language. Addressing the Jews, he asks, ' For in whom do all the peoples believe, if not in the anointed, who has already come ? ' In addition to the countries in which, according to the *Acts*, there were Jewish inhabitants, he mentions Gaetulia, Mauretania, Spain, ' the districts of Britain untrodden by the Romans, but subject to Christ ', Sarmatia, Germany, and ' many other distant and unknown lands, provinces and islands '. He declares that Christians nearly everywhere already formed the larger half of the population. ' Should we lack numbers and resources ', asks Tertullian (about 199), ' if we chose to display open hostility, instead of merely cherishing revenge in secret ? Are the Moors, the Marcomanni, and even the Parthians, and the greatest peoples, who yet are limited to a single country and their own district, more numerous than the population of the entire earth ? We are of yesterday ; yet we have already filled your whole dominion, cities, islands, fortresses, municipal towns, public places, even the camps, the tribes, the decuries, the palace, the senate, the forum '.

In this language there is no doubt great exaggeration, far more perhaps than would be the case if it were employed at the present day in reference to the proportion of Christians in all the populations of the world. It is also in direct contradiction to the statement of Origen (several decades later), who, exaggerating in the other direction, declares that the Christians were only ' very few ' in proportion to the entire population of the Roman empire. Statements quite accidentally preserved show that up to 98 some 42, up to 180 some 74, up to 325 more than 550, places contained Christian communities.

But in the Roman empire the Christians not only formed a small minority as late as the third century, but this minority, at least up to the beginning of the century, was drawn almost exclusively from the lowest classes of society. It was a joke amongst the heathen that the Christians could only convert the simple-minded, only slaves, women and children ;

that they were rude, uneducated and boorish; that the members of their communities were chiefly people of no account, artisans and old women. The Christians themselves did not dispute this. Jerome says: the community of Christ is recruited, not from the Lyceum and the Academy, but from the lowest rabble (*de vili plebecula*). It is expressly attested by Christian writers that, even up to the middle of the third century, the new faith counted only few adherents amongst the higher classes. Eusebius says that the peace which the Church enjoyed under Commodus, contributed greatly to its propagation, 'so that several persons in Rome, distinguished for their birth and wealth, turned to salvation with their entire household and family'. Origen (in the reign of Alexander Severus) says that 'at the present day rich men and many high dignitaries, as well as delicate and nobly born ladies, receive the Christian messengers of the word'; that is to say, Christianity then obtained successes of which it had not previously been able to boast. According to Tertullian, Severus took under his protection men and women of senatorial rank, who openly professed Christianity; and, as already observed, the indulgence shown by Callistus to distinguished female proselytes excited indignation in the Roman community. In 258, the emperor Valerian addressed a rescript to the senate, to the effect that Christians of senatorial and equestrian rank should be deprived of their possessions; if they persisted in their belief, they should be punished with death; Christian members of the imperial household and court should be condemned to forced labour in chains on the imperial domains. Consequently, from the time of Commodus onwards, the spread of Christianity amongst the upper classes is variously and expressly attested, whereas the reverse is the case in regard to the preceding period.

In complete agreement with this is the fact that, till about the end of the second century, Christians and Christianity are very rarely mentioned in classical literature, and then only casually, and in terms of indifference and contempt. The expressions of Tacitus and the younger Pliny show that, in the time of Trajan, the upper circles in Rome were not sufficiently interested in the new sect to take the trouble to obtain accurate information concerning it. Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius only mention the courage with which the

Christians went to their death. Both of them, however, consider this courage to be the result of obstinacy and familiarity with death, not of intelligent conviction; Marcus Aurelius also declared that it lacked dignity, and that there was even something theatrical about it. It has already been mentioned that Lucian saw nothing in the faith of the Christians but folly and infatuation. Galen, while recognizing the virtue of the Christians, felt nothing but astonishment and contempt for the complete belief of the followers of Moses and Christ in doctrines that were not proved, since he, like all the heathen, had absolutely no idea of a religious dogma. In the diffuse and extremely detailed history of Rome, carried down by Cassius Dio to his own days in the reign of Alexander Severus, no mention is expressly made of the Christians; according to him, the Christians persecuted under Domitian were accused of 'atheism and Jewish practices'; that is, he held the Christians to be a Jewish sect. Herodian does not mention them; and even the compilers of the imperial biographies (called *Scriptores historiae augustae*), some of whom wrote as early as the reign of Constantine, only notice them very seldom and casually. It was not till the middle of the second century that heathen writers began to attack Christianity. Fronto repeated the most ridiculous fabrications of the mob; and even the Platonist Celsus, who had been carefully informed by a Jew concerning the object of the Christian doctrine, in his lengthy treatise against it expressed himself to the effect that the dispute between Jews and Christians, which according to him turned entirely upon the question whether the prophesied saviour had already appeared or not, was nothing but a dispute 'about an ass's shadow'.[1]

The only persons of rank in the time before Commodus, whose conversion to Christianity seems probable, are the consul Flavius Clemens, executed in 95, and his wife (or sister) Flavia Domitilla, who was banished to Pontia. On the other hand, the far from clear excerpt from Dio in no way proves that the execution of Acilius Glabrio (consul 91) about the same time was due to his profession of Christianity; according to Suetonius, he was condemned for supposed revolutionary plans.

[1] A proverbial expression = 'about nothing at all'.

The old tradition of personal relations between the philosopher Seneca and the apostle Paul has not as yet been found to have any foundation in fact, although it is very easy to understand how it may have arisen. It was very natural to attribute the many points of agreement with Christian opinions and doctrines in the writings of Seneca to the influence of the apostle, whose two years' captivity in Rome might easily have brought him into contact with the philosopher, especially as the proconsul Junius Gallio (who acquitted Paul when he was brought before his tribunal by the Jews) was Seneca's brother. Tertullian, Lactantius, and Augustine make no mention of the tradition. Lactantius speaks of Seneca as 'ignorant of the true faith'; Augustine considers that his freedom from the superstitions of the heathen, which as a Roman senator he could not publicly announce, was the result of his philosophical studies; that he was astonished at the spread of Judaism (which he hated), because he was ignorant of the purpose of God; that he never mentioned the Christians, to avoid praising them in defiance of the national opinion, or blaming them, perhaps against his own feelings. Jerome had read certain letters (some of which are still extant), said to have been exchanged between the apostle and the philosopher; but they are in reality one of the numerous literary forgeries which were called into existence by the religious zeal of the Christians. An inscription (end of the third or beginning of the fourth century) shows that in a Christian family, which traced back its origin to or at least derived its name from that of the Annaei Senecae, the tradition was highly prized. An epitaph on a tomb at Ostia, set up by a certain Marcus Annaeus Paulus, preserves the memory of his son Marcus Annaeus Paulus Petrus. The names of the apostles were very popular amongst the Christians; the use of the second name and of the two together was unheard of amongst the heathen. There can be little doubt, therefore, that the two Annaei were both Christians.

Finally, if the possibility of personal relations between the apostle and the philosopher cannot be absolutely denied, all previous attempts to make this possibility a certainty must be considered to have completely failed. The agreement (often almost word for word) of the expressions used by Seneca with those of Paul concerning the general sinfulness

of mankind, must have been due to the similar circumstances, experiences and dispositions of both, like everything else in Seneca's writings which approximates to the Christian point of view. But this agreement may also be completely explained by the particular form in which the Stoic philosophy developed, a form which had its foundation in the nature of Stoicism itself, and in the milder representatives of the school (Seneca, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius) very naturally assumed a character sympathetic with Christianity, although no tradition has ever asserted that the two last named borrowed from Christian sources.

Consequently, judging from all that we know of the first centuries of the Christian era, it can hardly be imagined that the pagan world before the time of Septimius (emperor 193–211) and Alexander Severus (emperor 222–35), had the least anticipation of the future historical importance of the new religion, then so little regarded and so contemptuously criticized. What could this crowd of ignorant recluses, men of no importance, avail against the established order of things in an empire whose dominion of the world appeared destined to last for ever? 'Do not the Romans, without the assistance of your god, rule the whole world, including yourselves?' 'Your God', says Celsus, 'has promised his assistance to those who profess their belief in him, and even greater blessings, as you assert. And now, see for yourselves, what he has done for them (the Romans) and what he has done for you. Instead of being rulers of the whole earth, you have not even a clod of earth or a home that you can call your own; if you are found wandering about in secret, you are hunted down and punished with death'. In an empire in which so many religions existed side by side, the idea of a universal religion must have appeared absolutely incomprehensible. 'If it were only possible', says the same author, 'that all the Greeks and barbarians in Asia, Europe and Africa to the ends of the earth could recognize one law! But any one who thinks it possible is utterly devoid of understanding!'

The victory of Christianity was decided by the complete religious freedom guaranteed by Constantine. The victorious faith then immediately began to exercise its power in the suppression of paganism, at a time when the old belief had

not only ceased to offer any advantages, but entailed increasing annoyance and persecution upon its adherents. Had paganism really been for centuries in a state of decay and dissolution, its complete overthrow and the absolute supremacy of Christianity must have followed within a very short space of time. But, as a matter of fact, its death struggle, carried on under the greatest disadvantages, was prolonged for two centuries ; and polytheism, utterly powerless and defenceless as it was, still survived, although Christianity ever more and more indefatigably and relentlessly endeavoured to stifle everything in the old faith that still gave signs of life, by the aid of compulsion, robbery, destruction and persecution. This alone is sufficient to prove the great vitality of paganism even in its old age. After Constantine's edicts of toleration Christianity enjoyed the favour and encouragement of the secular authority for a period of seventy years (except for a brief reaction under Julian) ; and yet, as already observed, it can scarcely have won over half the population of the empire. Nearly all the Roman nobles in the time of Julian were devoted to the old religion, and in the time of Theodosius about half the senators, although at that time and subsequently Christianity had made far greater progress in the towns than in the country. In the course of the fourth century the word *paganus* (countryman) came to mean ' heathen ', and Endelechius in the poem quoted above (p. 197) calls Christ the god who is worshipped in the great cities as the only one. Judaism also in the *Diaspora* was chiefly, although not exclusively, a town religion.

But even during the persecution started by Theodosius in 380, which after the fall of the pretender Eugenius, who had been induced to put himself forward by Nicomachus Flavianus, the champion of paganism, was carried on with renewed vigour, the old belief showed remarkable powers of resistance. First in the East, then in the West, temples, chapels and seats of the ancient cults were laid low and reduced to ashes by fire and sword. But if the rural populations, scattered and defenceless as they were, were unable, in spite of their bitter complaints, to prevent the destruction of their sanctuaries, ' on which they placed all their hopes, for men, women and children, for their cattle, crops, and plantations, and the loss of which deprived them of all the joys of life '

(Libanius), in the towns bloody combats only too often took place between the populace and the furious clergy and monks. With the exception of direct compulsory conversion, every kind of violence was employed for the suppression of paganism. All sacrifices, ritual observances, and attendance in the temples were forbidden under threat of the severest penalties; the priests were deprived of their privileges and banished from the towns; the temple possessions were confiscated. Yet the repeated insistence upon these regulations and penalties during the fifth and even the sixth century, shows how extremely slow was the process of extirpation, even when the ancient faith seemed to have been deprived of all means of existence. That crime and rapacity combined with draconian legislative severity in the persecution of defenceless paganism, is proved by the repeated exhortations of Augustine, not to plunder the heathen under the cloak of religion, and by an imperial rescript of the year 423. Paganism also at that time had its martyrs, and the abominable murder of the beautiful and virtuous Hypatia at Alexandria in the year 415, shows to what deeds of horror the spirit of fanaticism could drive the Christian mob.

This systematic war of extermination waged against paganism had lasted for a hundred and fifty years, and yet the life of the ancient belief was not completely extinct. In 528 Justinian felt impelled to order a rigorous persecution of the so-called 'Hellenes'. In Constantinople itself numerous adherents of paganism were discovered and arrested amongst patricians, learned men and physicians; one of them took his own life, the rest embraced Christianity. In 532, Bishop John of Asia, by imperial command, made a tour of the provinces of Caria, Lydia and Phrygia, where he converted and baptized 70,000 souls. Any one found offering sacrifice to idols was to be punished with death. In the West, the advancing flood of barbarism, which swept away at the same time the foundations of paganism and ancient civilization generally, hastened the destruction of the former. Yet it was not until the year 529, when the country population of the neighbourhood was still in the main pagan, that the last temple of Apollo on Monte Casino was converted into a cloister by St. Benedict. In the same year the seven last Athenian philosophers, expelled by an edict of Justinian, emigrated

and sought refuge in Persia with King Chosroes. Gregory the Great (pope 590–604) learnt to his sorrow that all the peasants in Sardinia were idolaters, and sent bishop Victor to convert them; he directed the bishop of Caralis to proceed against idolaters, *haruspices* and soothsayers, who refused to be converted by his preaching; slaves were to receive corporal punishment, free citizens were to be 'brought to repentance' by close confinement. The worship of the old images of the gods was secretly practised (especially in Greece) not only during the middle ages, but in some cases even down to our own days. Under Alexius Comnenus the image of Artemis in Patmos was destroyed by monks; Michael Apostolius, the follower of Gemistius Pletho, about 1465 found in Crete statues of the gods, to which he could address his prayers.

But even so the annihilation of paganism could not be complete. It contained elements which defied all efforts to destroy them, since they were based upon certain imperative necessities of a great portion of mankind; and these elements, under new forms, have found a place in the heart of Christianity itself and thus survived the downfall of the ancient belief. It was not merely the heathen love of festivals which demanded satisfaction also from the new religion and caused the church to allow carousals and merry-makings at the graves of the martyrs, and to compensate the people for the abolition of the pagan festivals by fixing the celebration of Christian festivals on the same days. Above all, it was the profound desire to fill the infinite gulf between humanity and divinity with intermediate beings that re-peopled heaven, now deprived of its gods, with a band of heavenly figures, to whose number there was no limit. Although Augustine rejects the comparison of the worship of saints and martyrs with polytheism, other ecclesiastical writers, such as Basil, assign them exactly the same place in the order of the universe as the later Platonists assigned to demons and heroes, or, like Theodoret, institute comparisons between the two cults, in order to prove that 'the truly divine has been substituted for the false and erroneous'. In Sicily 'the worship of the saints exhibits so complete a survival of polytheism, that it is easy to understand why educated Sicilians even at the present day in all seriousness prefer the monotheism of Islam to Christianity'. But the old gods and heroes have not in

all cases been replaced by holy personalities of the new faith ; here and there they have maintained their ground, like Demeter worshipped at Eleusis, and Santa Venere invoked in southern Italy and Sicily ; or they have been changed into the new personalities, and their myths into Christian legends. Thus, apparently, here and there in Gaul the ' mothers ' of Celtic popular belief have become the three holy Maries ; Helios-Aumu, the driver of the chariot of the sun worshipped in the country east of the Jordan, has been transformed into the prophet Elijah ascending to heaven in a chariot drawn by fiery horses ; and Hippolytus, who probably came by a martyr's death in the mines of Sardinia, according to the tradition was torn to pieces by horses—the fate which befel his namesake, the son of Theseus king of Attica.

' Least of all ', said Theodoret, ' ought the Greeks to be offended at what takes place at the graves of the martyrs, for it is with them that the libations, expiatory sacrifices, the heroes, the demi-gods, the deified men have originated. Heracles, Asclepius, Dionysus and many others were raised to the rank of gods ; how then can the Christians be reproached for honouring the martyrs as witnesses and servants of God, without making gods of them ? Who deserves it better than they, the champions of mankind, their helpers and protectors, from whom they avert evil and drive away the afflictions with which they are threatened by the demons ? Childless and barren women pray to them that they may become mothers ; he who has received a gift, implores them to preserve it ; those who are starting on a journey, beg them to attend them on the way, those who return safely render to them their thanks ; the votive offerings presented to them, gold and silver models of eyes, feet and hands, are evidence of vows fulfilled. The temples of the gods are destroyed, for the lord of all has introduced his own dead in their place, has driven them out and bestowed their honours upon his own children. In place of the Pandia, Diasia, Dionysia and other festivals, those of Peter, Paul, Thomas, Sergius, Marcellus and other martyrs are celebrated '. The assertion of Theodoret, that these celebrations are accompanied by Christian sobriety and modesty, not by pagan ostentation and sensuality, must be accepted with considerable reserve, as is shown by the evidence of Christian writers.

CHAPTER III

PHILOSOPHY AS A MORAL EDUCATOR

No one who has even a superficial acquaintance with classical literature needs to be reminded that, in antiquity, morality as a whole is most intimately connected with religion; that the gods, as directors of the moral order of the world and executors of its laws, require from men the fulfilment of moral obligations, reward the good and punish the evil. It has been shown that polytheism continued to exist unchanged amongst the masses down to a late period of antiquity; it remains to refute the idea that the anthropomorphism of the Greek religion, which had infected the national faith of the Romans, exercised a demoralizing influence by attributing to the gods human weaknesses and passions and representing them as transgressors of the moral laws. Of course, this was a favourite argument of the Christians in their struggle with paganism. The heathen cannot possibly be virtuous, says Lactantius, even if they are naturally good, since the example of their gods trains them to vice—Jupiter to adultery, Mars to bloodshed, Mercury to fraud, and so forth. Augustine even held the opinion that the evil spirits worshipped by the heathen allowed themselves to be accused of disgraceful deeds which they had never committed, in order to ensnare the minds of men and to drag them to destruction with themselves. But even amongst the adherents of polytheism many looked with suspicion on those 'stories, which taught men to sin'. Dionysius of Halicarnassus preferred Roman theology to Greek, since the legends in the latter were of little use and only serviceable to the few who understood their real meaning, while, on the other hand, they taught the great mass of mankind, untrained in philosophy, to despise the gods, or to regard as lawful the infamies and crimes attributed to them.

This assertion of Dionysius, in his attack upon the absurdity of the popular belief, is the more easy to understand, since it may be assumed that sophistic, which delighted in showing its skill in defence and even in praise of what was reprehensible, did not disdain to borrow arguments from legend; thus, in the *Clouds* of Aristophanes, the 'Unjust Argument' raises the question why, if justice exists, Zeus was not punished for having bound his father with chains. In the *Homilies* of the so-called Clement of Rome a virtuous woman is said to have been seduced by an 'encomium of adultery'; perhaps this was a subject in the rhetorical schools, for practice in the art of making the bad appear good and the wrong right. The defence of adultery, which chiefly relies upon the amours of Jupiter and the other gods (and also the teachings of the philosophers) is followed by a refutation, perhaps also a subject for rhetorical exercises. If we should imitate the gods in their amours, why not in their meals? Cronus devoured his children, Zeus swallowed Metis, Pelops was set on table as a dish before the assembled gods. In fact, it is inconceivable that the acts attributed by legend to the gods could ever have really misled, even in ancient times, the moral consciousness of men of ordinary intellect and moral responsibility; that adulterers, murderers and thieves could ever have seriously attempted to justify their crimes, to themselves and others, by the examples of Jupiter, Mercury and other gods. Amongst the proofs adduced by Ovid in support of the proposition that there is nothing which cannot do harm, if misused, he says that women who are ingenious in discovering excuses for sin, might be led into it by the traditional immoralities of the goddesses: 'Corrupt minds can be led astray by anything'. On this point Seneca expresses himself as if he had no fear whatever of the possibility of a belief in the legends so absolute as to remove all fear of sin from men's minds; and no doubt he is right. For if the unbelieving rejected the popular belief just because of these fables, the rationalists, as always, explained the contradictions between tradition and the demands of reason by artificial (euhemeristic or allegorical) interpretations, or by the assumption that the immoral acts attributed to the gods were really committed by the merely semi-divine demons; while naïve and unreflecting believers were content in such cases to recog-

nize mysteries too deep for human understanding, from which no rules for human action could be derived.

Greek and Roman literature furnishes abundant evidence of the existence of the belief in a moral order of the universe, based upon and maintained by the will of the gods. Against this evidence, appeal is made to certain frivolous jests in comedies and erotic poems, in which amorous swains excuse their cunning devices, their lapses from morality and even deeds of shame, by the example of Jupiter and the other gods. They even quote the monologue of Byblis (in the *Metamorphosis* of Ovid), who attempts to justify her unnatural passion for her brother by the marriages of the gods with their sisters! With equal or even more reason it might be asserted, as was often done to the embarrassment of the ancient Christian apologists, that the sins of the patriarchs and other men after God's own heart in the Old Testament have exercised a demoralizing influence; and an attempt might be made to support the assertion by jokes or coarse expressions of a similar character in modern literature, in which 'the devil appeals to Scripture'; we may mention one of Bürger's poetical trifles, *Frau Schnips*. It is hardly necessary to remind the reader that not only were such offences everywhere severely punished by civil legislation, but that the gods were worshipped and invoked as protectors of the same laws which, according to the legend, they had broken. In particular, was not the Greek Zeus, like the Roman Jupiter, a god of marriage?

In every religion a mistaken idea of the nature and will of the deity may be found. Benjamin Constant, whose remarks upon polytheism generally are also applicable to the polytheism of our period, very rightly observes that the general spirit of religious creeds is often in contradiction to their moral commandments, and that the passions aroused by the former hinder the fulfilment of the latter; that murders are frequently committed in all good faith, in order to please a god, one of whose commandments is, 'Thou shalt not kill'! 'The fables consecrated by a religion are the object of a faith in certain respects mechanical; they sometimes appear to establish themselves permanently in a special compartment of the human brain. Rome traced back its origin to an amour of Mars with Rhea Silvia; none the less, any

vestal who allowed herself to be seduced suffered a fearful punishment'.

The undoubtedly correct view, that the licence which the gods in legend permit themselves in reference to the moral law by no means indicates their indifference to it, is illustrated by Constant by the example of kings, whose private excesses do not affect the laws against excesses committed by their subjects. 'In the Macedonian camp the soldier accused of murder was condemned by Alexander, although he himself was the murderer of Clitus. The gods, like the great ones of the world, have a public and a private character. In the former they are the upholders of morality, in the latter they follow only their own inclinations; but only in their public character have they anything to do with men'.

'The gods are not the originators, but the guarantors of the moral law. They protect it, but do not alter it; they do not issue its commandments, but keep them in force. They reward good and punish evil, but their will does not decide what is good and evil; human actions are meritorious or the reverse in themselves."

But, although belief in the government of divine powers, respect for their will, hope of their favour and fear of their wrath were always reckoned among the most essential supports of morality throughout antiquity and (as already observed) were recognized as such, they were not, properly speaking, the foundations of morality. The duties of man to the divinity, to humanity and to himself were not proclaimed by the revelations of a higher will, nor by the teaching of a divine prophet; the heathen had not received the law from without; as the apostle says, they were a law unto themselves; and had to depend not only upon their own knowledge of their duties, but also upon their own strength. They had no idea of an absolute truth, founded upon supernatural revelation, and could not understand that faith, and, above all, the subordination of reason to faith, could be meritorious and possess a redeeming and sanctifying virtue. In their opinion the highest task of the thinking mind was the search after truth, to which in the conviction of Christians revelation had set a limit for ever, so that henceforth it was not only superfluous, but even unlawful. The heathen, says Tertullian, are ever

seeking truth, but never find it; we have no need of curious questioning now that we have Christ Jesus, nor of inquiry now that we have the Gospel. If we believe this, we desire to believe nothing besides. Thou shalt believe! This, according to Julian the apostate, was the final conclusion of Christian wisdom; and Galen the physician, who had a high opinion of the morality of the Christians, could not understand their absolute belief (like that of the Jews) in doctrines which had not been proved true. While the messengers of Christianity promised redemption by faith, heathen philosophy proclaimed salvation by knowledge. The knowledge of good and evil, promised (according to *Genesis*) by the tempter, was for it the attainable object of all human aspirations, the foundation to be laid by man's own efforts, on which alone morality could be based. According to Socrates, knowledge is the root of all moral action, ignorance that of all errors; knowledge can no more exist without virtue than virtue without knowledge. In the same way the Stoics defined virtue as knowledge, vice as ignorance. Consequently, virtue and with it happiness in this life were attainable by knowledge, which enabled man to subject his lower impulses to the divine element in his nature. For paganism knew nothing of human nature being thoroughly bad, of the doctrine of original sin; even according to the Orphic doctrine it contained the good derived from Dionysus as well as the bad derived from the Titans. Hence, also, the idea of the need of redemption by supernatural grace was foreign to the spirit of the ancients and only found acceptance as their intellect decayed and lost its vigour. No greater contrast can be imagined than that between the self-control of the philosopher unaffected by mysticism, his proud consciousness of his ability to subdue all passions and desires, and the Christian's feeling of dependence, his need of redemption and his absolute subjection to the will of God. Among the cardinal virtues of paganism there was as little room for humility as for the patience which after a blow on one cheek turns the other to the smiter.

For him who knows (i.e. the wise man) the evils which torment humanity have no existence; or at least they are unable to disturb his happiness, which is self-sufficient and self-contained. Yet, as Socrates said, the whole life of the philoso-

pher is a preparation for death, which had less terror for him than for any other man. By knowledge man is raised above the level of human weakness, withdrawn from the influences of the outer world, and is invulnerable to its attacks. But this happiness consisted not in possession but in renunciation, in the absence of all needs (for which cynicism quite consistently strove), in the abandonment not only of external possessions but also of the most important interests, of the innate feelings and inclinations of human nature which contribute most to happiness. The motto of Epictetus, 'Suffer and renounce!' in a certain sense sums up the practical philosophy, and consequently the theory of happiness, of all philosophical systems. The aim of all knowledge, says Seneca, is to teach us to despise life; only he who is free is happy, says Demonax, and only he is free who hopes for nothing and fears nothing. Epicureanism and Stoicism are at one with Christianity in their seclusion from political life; like the apostle Paul, Epicurus and also Epictetus placed celibacy above marriage; scepticism based happiness upon the knowledge of the impossibility of knowledge, consequently, in reality, upon a renunciation of knowledge.

Ancient philosophy, therefore, overcame the terrors of death not by the hope of celestial happiness, but by the knowledge of the small value of earthly existence. The Christian belief and hope, the love which springs from respect for that which is beneath us, were equally unknown to paganism. It was Christianity that first taught mankind, 'to recognize humility and poverty, mockery and contempt, outrage and misery, suffering and death as divine, and to honour and love even sin and crime as not hindering, but promoting holiness' (Goethe). Such an idea was foreign to the ancient world, although traces of the feeling occur now and again. Plato and Aristotle proposed that sickly and mutilated children should be put to death in the ideal state. Seneca thinks no more of drowning crippled and misshapen children than of drowning mad dogs and unhealthy cattle, which might infect the whole herd. In his opinion, only men of no intelligence can consider the wise man too harsh if, in accordance with the Stoic doctrines, he neither feels compassion nor forgives. The wise man must not allow his serenity of mind to be disturbed by sympathy or other emotions, for this is a weakness of feeble

minds, especially women ; he may dry the tears of those who weep, but not weep with them ; he may help them, but not pity them. In like manner, he may allow gentleness and mercy to prevail, but may not forgive ; for forgiveness is the remission of merited punishment.

In ancient times, man did not feel himself separated from the divinity by an impassable gulf, since his relation to it was not that of a creature to its creator ; and this difference in his relation to the divinity carried with it also a different relation to humanity. The fundamental Christian idea, that all men are created by one creator, children of one father, and consequently united by the bond of brotherhood, possessing equal rights and equally bound to perform the same charitable duties, is a view that was first developed in antiquity outside the domain of Christianity in the time of the Roman universal empire ; but it never became general. In contrast to this absolute equality of all creatures before God, the ancient Greeks and Romans recognized, as founded on justice, the numerous gradations of human existence, the result of political, social and national developments ; and no divine prohibition nor moral law hindered the privileged from asserting his better claims in their full extent against one whose claims were inferior. In the eyes of his fellow, the life of man was not so sacred and inviolable as it was bound to be in the presence of a divinity with whom all life originates, and who has not only not allowed but expressly forbidden his creatures to take each other's lives, a right which belongs to him alone. The position assigned to man by the ancient conception of the order of the universe allowed him, together with greater freedom and independence, far more latitude in the disposal of his own existence or of that of those who were under his protection or authority. Not only had the master the power of life and death over his slaves ; the father had the same power over his children, and it was not till late that it was made a punishable offence to expose them. Opinions were divided as to whether suicide was morally permissible. Plato, who in this respect also shows an approximation to Christianity, denied that it was (following the Pythagoreans) ; man, as the property of the divinity, must not leave the place assigned to him on his own initiative ; Plotinus, however, considered it justifiable in certain circumstances. The Stoics and Cynics not only

declared that it was permissible, but saw in it the highest practical proof of moral freedom.

As for the attitude of the Christians in the early centuries towards the heathen system of ethics, they failed, at least to a great extent, to perceive the sharp and fundamental contrast between ' virtue from justice and virtue from mercy '. Clement of Alexandria, like all Christians who at that time were indebted in the main to Greek philosophy in their education, had no doubt that it also contained truth, whether this truth was borrowed by the philosophers from the Old Testament or brought to them by inferior angels ; what was false in it was the result of misunderstandings or was foisted in by false prophets sent by the devil. The relation of philosophy to Christianity was that of the derived to the original, of fragments and parts to the single whole ; it was a forerunner of Christ, which trained men for the perfection that was to be embodied in him ; as the law was given to the Jews, so philosophy was given to the heathen. Thus, some Jews and heathen were just before God ; above all Plato and his teacher Socrates (who in Luther's eyes were godless pagans) spoke in accordance with the spirit of God. Even for Christians philosophy was valuable, nay, indispensable ; the Christian writers who disdained it were afraid of it, as children of ghosts, and had formed no opinion of it.

From the middle of the second century B.C., Greek philosophy (as already observed) had begun to make its way to Rome and the West, and, in spite of all attempts to check it, had made constant progress. The multiplication of relations with Greece, the ever-increasing immigration of Greek savants to Rome, the more and more frequent journeys of Romans to Greece, where they frequently stayed for a considerable time, gave a powerful impetus to the introduction of Greek art and science, and of philosophy in particular. When Cicero employed the enforced leisure of his last years (45–43) in rendering accessible to Roman readers in a popular form the most important results of the post-Aristotelian philosophy, he evidently supplied a general want that was keenly felt by his educated countrymen. His philosophical works, which have done so much to introduce the knowledge of Greek philosophy to all succeeding ages, formed the nucleus of the new philo-

sophical literature of Rome. Amongst its best read writers Quintilian reckons (Lucretius excepted) the Stoics Brutus Plautus and Seneca, Cornelius Celsus (the follower of the Sextii, who were closely akin to the Stoics), and the Epicurean Catius, the only addition to whose numbers in the second century A.D., is the Platonist Apuleius.

Now, although after the fall of the Republic the influences favourable to the spread of Greek philosophy in the Roman world increased in number and strength, the old Roman dislike of it, based in the main on the opposition between the practical and the theoretical, between realism and idealism, continued to exist. The view expressed by one of the characters in Ennius, that it was good to ' take a sip of ' philosophy, but not to become absorbed in it, was also that of Tacitus and all like-minded Roman statesmen and patriots, who were bound to oppose a speculative system, which led to indifference to the State and its most important interests. Although an acquaintance with the doctrines of philosophy, ' that noble science ', was regarded as worthy of commendation ; although a salutary influence ' that moderated the passions ' was conceded to it ; yet, among these circles, over-zealous study of its doctrines was considered reprehensible in a Roman and a senator. Helvidius Priscus, who studied Stoicism ' in order that he might take part in state affairs better equipped against the blows of fortune', and in all relations of life satisfied the highest claims of morality, was according to Tacitus an exception, since the majority only affected ' the higher studies in order to conceal an indolent inactivity under a high-sounding name '. In Tacitus the highly respected Musonius Rufus plays the part of a ridiculous pedant, who parades his knowledge on the most unsuitable occasions ; in the year 70 he attempted to influence the legions of Antonius before the gates of Rome by addressing them on the blessings of peace and the evils of war, and with difficulty escaped ill-treatment at the hands of the soldiers. Quintilian also contrasts the ' true citizen and truly wise man, who devotes himself not to idle discussions but to the administration of the state ', with the philosophers who hold themselves as far aloof as possible from all the duties of a citizen in general. ' What philosopher', he asks, ' has ever been prominent as a judge or orator ? What philosopher has ever interested himself in the manage-

ment of state affairs, for which, however, the majority of them are fond of laying down rules ? ' The younger Pliny praises Titius Aristo as a man inferior in purity, piety, justice, and strength of mind to none of those who make an outward show of philosophy. ' Yet he does not frequent gymnasia and porticoes, nor spend his time and that of others in idle and lengthy discussions, but he always wears the *toga* and is always busy '. Men of this practical turn of mind must have regarded a regular study of philosophy as intolerable in the case of a ruler. Some expressions of the pretender Avidius Cassius afford a specimen of the manner in which the philosophical studies of Marcus Aurelius were criticized by the opponents of philosophy. He calls the emperor ' the disputant ', ' the philosophical old woman ', ' he institutes researches into the nature of the elements, of men's souls, of virtue and justice, and has no heart for affairs of state. You have heard that our philosopher's praefect of the praetorian guard, who was as poor as a beggar three days before his appointment, has suddenly become rich '. When Alexander Severus, on the advice of his mother Mammaea, gave up the study of music and philosophy, he was strengthened in his resolution by the Virgilian verses, quoted to him in place of an oracle, in which it was declared that the Romans were called upon to rule the world, while others might be allowed to carry off the prize in the arts and sciences.

In like manner Nero's mother dissuaded her son from the study of philosophy, to which he had been introduced first by the Stoic Chaeremon and then by Seneca, on the ground that it was ' injurious to one who was destined to rule '. In the circles which took a lively interest in the maintenance of the established order of things, above all in governmental and court circles, philosophy was not so much despised as feared. Caesarism, not without reason, saw in ' ideology ' a danger to itself. The speech in Cassius Dio, in which Maecenas unfolds the principles of imperial policy in presence of Augustus, also contains a warning to the emperor to be on his guard against philosophers, who propagated revolutionary ideas. He must not believe that all real or pretended philosophers were worthy and honest men, since Areus and Athenodorus had proved themselves such ; many wear this mask, in order that they may work incalculable mischief to states and individuals.

In fact, like the murderers of Julius Caesar, many critics of the government, and especially the most prominent leaders of the opposition in the senate in the first century, professed the doctrines of the Stoic school. Amongst them were republicans, such as Paetus Thrasea and Helvidius Priscus, whose aim was political martyrdom, and of those who took part in the Pisonian conspiracy (65) against Nero at least Lucan and Seneca. Besides, the emperors in general were only too ready to listen to insinuations against Stoicism and philosophy. In 62 Rubellius Plautus had been put to death while in exile, a man who, as Tigellinus represented to Nero, ' made a show of imitating the ancient Romans, and had adopted the arrogance of the Stoic school, which formed and produced turbulent spirits ever seeking danger (*negotiorum*) '. [1] Nero was instigated to persecute Thrasea (in 66) by Capito Cossutianus, who represented to him Thrasea's abstention from the deliberations of the senate as an act of rebellion, and Thrasea himself as the head of a faction. He declared that he had partisans, or rather satellites, who, although they did not yet venture to imitate the audacity of his language, reproduced his demeanour and manner ; stern and morose, as if constantly reproaching the emperor for his excesses. Either their principles must be adopted, so far as they are preferable, or the leaders and instigators of these innovators must be removed. It is this sect that has produced the Tuberos and the Favoniuses, names hateful even to the old republic. In order to overthrow the monarchy, they make use of liberty as a pretext ; when they have overthrown it, they proceed to attack liberty. Helvidius Priscus, Thrasea's son-in-law, who was reported to be in the habit of celebrating, together with his father-in-law, the birthdays of Brutus and Cassius, was banished (for the second time) under Vespasian and put to death in exile. Priscus, who was subsequently reckoned among the celebrated ideal figures of the Stoic school and is mentioned with respect by the younger Pliny and even by Tacitus (in spite of his prejudice against political martyrdom), was condemned by conservative monarchists, like Suetonius and Cassius Dio, who throw the responsibility for his downfall upon himself. According to Suetonius, Vespasian endured Priscus' defiant obstinacy with

[1] i.e. political martyrdom. Others translate 'eager to take part in public affairs'.

extreme patience, tried to prevent his death when it was unfortunately too late, and restrained his wrath, until he had submitted to numerous impertinent remarks, delivered in the manner of a reprimand'. Only fragments and excerpts from Dio's account have been preserved. He certainly attempts to fix the odium of the proceedings against Helvidius and the philosophers upon Vespasian's powerful friend Mucianus, but at the same time declares that Helvidius was seditious and a friend of the mob, that he had always abused the monarchy and praised democracy, acted accordingly and incited others to do the same; as if it were the task of philosophy to throw mud at the government, to stir up the masses, to overthrow the existing order of things and to bring about a revolution. Helvidius imitated Thrasea, but was greatly his inferior. Thrasea's opposition was directed against a Nero, but his words and actions were always temperate; he confined himself to passive resistance. Helvidius, on the other hand, was dissatisfied with a Vespasian and opposed him in public and in private; he sought death and thereby paid the penalty of numerous offences. According to Dio, other Stoics, as well as the Cynic Demetrius (for whom Seneca expresses his admiration), publicly expressed views incompatible with the existing order of things. The result was that (between the years 71 and 75) all the philosophers were expelled from Rome, with the single exception of Musonius Rufus (who had been banished by Nero); Demetrius and a certain Hostilius were deported to islands. In 93, the philosophers were again banished by Domitian, in connexion with the trial of the Stoic Junius Arulenus Rusticus, who in a panegyric on Thrasea had called him a holy man, and of other senators who held the same views: 'this prosecution was directed entirely against the political opposition, wherever it manifested itself in literature and the lecturer's chair, and while the most famous writers were criminally punished, the government expelled the others *en masse* from the capital'.

But after the death of Domitian the whole system of government was changed, and with it the attitude of the emperors towards philosophy, which not only ceased to be regarded as hostile to the government, but was soon encouraged in every way. In a letter written immediately after Domitian's death (96 or 97) Pliny expresses his delight at the glorious revival of

intellectual life in Rome, as attested by numerous and glorious examples, of which it would be sufficient to mention one, the lectures of the Stoic philosopher Euphrates. Pliny also praises Trajan for taking special interest in the education of youth, and for highly honouring teachers of rhetoric and philosophy. ' Studies, which had been punished with exile by a prince, who, conscious of his vices, proscribed, from fear rather than hatred, everything that was opposed to vice, are now fostered and made much of by Trajan. They are full of life and vigour, and have recovered their native land '; Dio of Prusa, who under Domitian had lived in (voluntary) exile, returned after his death. The reign of his former friend Nerva was too short for him to enjoy the benefit of his favour ; Trajan, however, is said to have purposely distinguished him, and Dio, in one of his hortatory speeches on the government, declares that the emperor took pleasure in truth and frankness alone, not in flattery and lies. Hadrian, who sought the society of philosophers and of all men of learning, was perhaps the first who appointed public teachers of philosophy in Rome. Antoninus Pius appointed them in all the provinces, and according to his letter to the diet of the province of Asia the immunity from taxation, which in the case of other teachers was limited to a certain number, fixed in accordance with the size of the towns, was to be unrestricted in the case of philosophers, since there were so few of them. The salaries of the learned men summoned to the museum, including the philosophers, continued to be paid to them ; at Athens public teachers were appointed by Marcus Aurelius from the four most important schools.

Under this philosopher on the throne philosophy became the fashion, even amongst the women ; Stoicism, formerly so persecuted, was now considered a recommendation, and those who wished to get on pretended to adopt it or made a show of it. Among the emperor's philosophical tutors the Stoic Junius Rusticus and the Peripatetic Gnaeus Claudius Severus were influential and highly honoured. The former, a son or grandson of the Junius Rusticus executed by Domitian, was the adviser of Marcus Aurelius in all public and private affairs, and his words had great weight, in time of peace as well as war ; the emperor always embraced him before going on to the praefects of the praetorian guard, twice nominated him consul and after his death ordered the senate to erect statues in his honour.

Gnaeus Claudius Severus, a distinguished citizen, had already been consul in 146 ; Marcus Aurelius made his son of the same name (consul 163 and 173) his son-in-law. Of the later emperors Septimius Severus, following the example of Marcus Aurelius, showed especial interest in philosophy, and according to Tertullian allowed philosophers great liberty of speech ; in spite of their attacks upon the emperors they received salaries and the honour of statues. Severus's wife, Julia Domna, also turned her attention to philosophy, after she had quarrelled with him as the result of the intrigues of the favourite Plautianus, and surrounded herself with philosophers.

Further, at the time when philosophy was suspected and persecuted, there was no lack of philosophers who zealously strove to represent themselves and their learning as entirely harmless to the government. Martial's friend and countryman, the advocate Decianus of Emerita, professed himself a follower of Thrasea and Cato ; in other words, he was a Stoic, but shrewd enough not ' to run with bare breast against drawn swords ', for which he is commended by Martial. The poet declares he does not want a man who purchases fame by his blood, rashly shed, but one who deserves praise without martyrdom. Seneca in his letters has repeatedly defended philosophy against the reproach of hostility to the government. In a letter, which may have been written about the time when philosophy began to be looked upon with suspicion, he speaks as if it were quite inconceivable that it could ever be so suspected, although his defence itself shows that it had already been attacked on this ground. One must flee from the dangers of the world and find a sure refuge in philosophy, the science which affords protection not only amongst the good but also amongst those who are not utterly bad, like the priest's fillet, which even the worst respect. Never will worthlessness be so powerful, never will there be such a conspiracy against virtue, that the name of philosophy will not continue to be holy and venerable. Further, the philosopher must behave quietly and modestly. If it is asked whether Cato acted in this way, Seneca replies that he expressly disapproves of his participation not only in the civil war but also in the party quarrels that preceded it, as quite useless. He points to the example of the Stoics, who, retiring from political life, in their seclusion exert themselves for the ennoblement

of life and the establishment of the universal rights of man, 'without offence to one who is more powerful'. The wise man will not try to disturb universally adopted customs by his example, nor to attract the attention of the people by the novelty of his manner of life. Certainly, even he cannot be sure of absolute security. In a later letter, on the other hand, the charges against philosophy are refuted as if they had already been brought. 'They appear to me to be wrong, who think that the true followers of philosophy are obstinate and refractory, despisers of the authorities, kings and state administrators'. On the contrary, no one is more grateful to the latter than the philosphers, who have the greatest need of order and quietness in order to pursue their higher aims in life and reverence him who protects them like a father, far more than those restless and ambitious spirits, who have much to thank princes for, but also set a high value on their own services and are never satisfied with their reward. But the sincere and upright man, who has renounced the curia, the forum and political life, in order to occupy himself with higher things, loves those who make it possible for him to do this in safety; he alone bears witness on their behalf without being bribed, and is greatly indebted to them without their knowing it. As he reverences and esteems his teachers, thanks to whose kindness he has escaped the paths of error, so also he honours those under whose protection he is enabled to devote himself to noble pursuits. The benefits of universal peace are shared to a greater extent by those who make a right use of them. Again, in a later letter, he says: One must not make a boast of philosophy, for it has proved a source of danger to many who have practised it with arrogance and disdain: 'it is intended to eradicate your own faults, not to reproach others with theirs. It must not hold aloof from general custom, nor appear to condemn that which it avoids. It is possible to be wise without display or making oneself odious'. The appeal to philosophers to avoid anything out of the way, is often repeated; the very name of philosophy is already hated, even if it is practised with modesty; the more so if any one by making a show of exaggerated asceticism and contempt for the world violates traditional custom; in that case what is intended to excite admiration easily becomes hateful and ridiculous. Philosophy ought not to be used as a sign-board, a man should

even conceal his retirement, to prevent its becoming the subject of conversation and attracting attention.

It thus appears that Seneca by no means attempted only to represent as baseless the apprehensions and charges brought against philosophy by the representatives and uncompromising supporters of the existing political system, the latter of whom must have been very numerous in all circles, since they reckoned amongst them all who desired peace and order at any price as the basis of all material progress. To the mass of the people philosophy, with its high moral claims, its severe condemnation of laxity of morals, its homilies and admonitions, which unceasingly attempted to rouse them from their self-complacent indolence, must have been exceedingly annoying; and further, the claim of philosophers, that they were better and stood on a higher level than other men, was the more offensive the more strikingly it manifested itself in dress and appearance, manner of life and other externalities. This is the tenor of the complaint against Stoicism addressed by Mucianus to Vespasian according to Cassius Dio. The Stoics, he says, are full of vanity and arrogance. A long beard, uplifted eyebrows, a coarse cloak and bare feet, are thought to entitle a man to pass himself off as wise, manly and just, and to give himself airs, even though he is ignorant of the rudiments of knowledge. They look down upon all other men with contempt, reproach the handsome man with lack of control, the wealthy with avarice, the poor with servility and so forth. Dio of Prusa gives the same reason for the general unpopularity of philosophy in Greece. The philosopher's attire, his cloak without a tunic, his long hair and beard, expose the wearer to sneers, scorn and derision, and even ill-treatment; for most men suspect philosophers of despising all who are not philosophers, of condemning and secretly ridiculing them because of their ignorance of what really benefits mankind, especially the rich, who are the objects of general envy. Hence most people think it their duty to anticipate the philosophers' ridicule and contempt, to represent them as fools and madmen whenever possible, and thereby at the same time to show that they have reason on their side. In short, the dress which marks every one who wears it as a relentless monitor, a censor and a moralist, is as universally disliked as the schoolmaster's dress by children.

In addition to these antipathies, the half-educated and uneducated masses had a very cogent reason to despise and ridicule the laborious studies on which so high a value was placed. They were completely useless, they brought neither promotion nor reputation, nor as a rule money. Persius, who represents the inflated provincials as despising all higher (Greek) culture, introduces the centurions (who appear to have been the leaders of fashion in other respects in the Italian towns, and everywhere enjoyed amongst the middle and lower classes of society no less authority than they claimed by their consequential and overbearing manner), as expressing their contempt for philosophy as a profession whereby it is impossible to earn one's bread. If any one ventures to praise the freedom enjoyed by the wise man in the presence of those men with swollen legs, a gigantic Fulfennius immediately breaks into a horse-laugh and offers a worn-out 100-*as* piece for a hundred Greeks. 'I,' says another of this unsavoury crew, 'I know all I have any need to know. I don't care to be like your Arcesilases and self-tormenting Solons, stooping their heads, fixing their eyes on the ground, as they stand grumbling to themselves or silently move their lips like madmen, and with lower lip put forward seem to be weighing their words in the balance, deeply pondering over the dreams of some sick dotard, such as, Nothing can come out of nothing, nothing can return to nothing. Is it for this that you look so pale? is it for this that you go without your dinner? The people are amused at them, and muscular youths burst into a horse-laugh again and again, enough to twist their nostrils.' Capitalists and business men also naturally had a profound contempt for philosophers. Trimalchio leaves directions that on his tombstone should be inscribed: 'He began in a small way and became great; he has left 30,000,000 sesterces (about £300,000) and has never listened to a philosopher'.

The learned world also reproached philosophy with being a completely useless and superfluous science, in the name and on the part of a healthy common sense, which then, as at all times, claimed to have long since attained the same end and the same results which speculation endeavoured to reach by painfully circuitous paths, and accordingly denied that it had anything to learn from philosophy. What, in particular, was the use of the numerous artificial systems of moral phil-

osophy, as compared with the simple and incontestable law of morality which is implanted in all men's hearts? Further, which philosophy could be said to teach the truth, since each school declared the doctrines of all other schools to be false?

From this point of view philosophy was attacked especially by those who regarded eloquence as the aim of all educational efforts, who probably in the later days of antiquity formed the majority of the educated classes. This quite natural jealousy between rhetoricians and philosophers, 'the artists of the pure form of speech and the investigators of the inmost nature of things', which was based upon internal antagonism and was continually fostered by external causes, led to incessant and frequently embittered disputes as to the relative value of the two sciences. Pupils were already trained to take part in these struggles. Amongst the 'controversial' themes which were the subject of declamation in the rhetorical schools was the following: A father leaves three sons, an orator, a philosopher and a physician; by his will he appoints as his sole or favoured heir the one who is able to show that he renders most service to the state. Speeches are then delivered in favour of each of the three sciences and against the other two. The complete uselessness of philosophy is shown by its fruits. The question so often asked, whether virtue can be taught, is answered in the negative. The best men, the Fabricii, the Decii, became what they were without philosophy; on the other hand, the greatest criminals had been produced by the philosophical schools, as tyrants and enemies of their country by that of Socrates. But, even granting that wisdom can be acquired by instruction, the method to be adopted will always be uncertain, for all the schools contradict each other. Besides, many philosophers confess that, in spite of all efforts, a truly wise man has never existed. What, therefore, is the use of philosophy? Would it be of service in war or in civil employment? Nothing is to be found in its votaries but hypocrisy, idleness, and arrogance, by which they manage to acquire a certain influence. Their assertion, that they contribute to the diminution of vice, is contradicted by evidence.

That the teachers of eloquence were bound to be, at least in great measure, opponents of philosophy on principle, is obvious. A treatise attributed to Plutarch is directed against them. The elder Seneca's son declares that his father hated

philosophy and prevented his wife from studying it seriously. Quintilian, who strongly maintained the elder Cato's idea, that the orator was 'a morally good man, skilled in speech', affirmed that ethics was properly a branch of oratory; that it had only been separated from it through the fault of the orators who had neglected it, and had been taken possession of by 'feebler minds' and made a speciality by them; the orators must reclaim this branch of oratory as their own. Since the true philosopher can be nothing else but a morally good man, that is, the same as the true orator, a special science of philosophy is superfluous. Quintilian uses every opportunity of expressing his irritation with philosophers, of lashing their servilely painful adherence to the doctrines and expressions of the school, their endless and sophistical investigations, their complicated methods of framing the simplest propositions, their arrogance and hypocrisy, their idleness and avoidance of the world so detrimental to the interests of the state, and at the same time takes delight in exposing the weaknesses of individual schools. Dio of Prusa also, when a rhetorician, had passionately attacked philosophy, to which he subsequently devoted himself.

Fronto expresses his rage in truly comic fashion against philosophy, which had caused his imperial pupil Marcus Aurelius to desert the study of eloquence. This was all the more to be regretted, as Marcus, as Fronto writes to him, had already distinguished himself as a boy by nobility of spirit and dignity of ideas, which only lacked brilliancy of expression; the preparations and efforts necessary to secure the latter had been too laborious for him; he had consequently abandoned the study of eloquence and had suddenly jumped off to philosophy, in which there was 'no introduction to be carefully elaborated, no narrative to be constructed concisely, clearly and skilfully, no arguments to be sought for, in fact nothing of special importance'. Of course, he found matters easier with his teachers of philosophy. He only had to listen to their explanations and nod his head in token that he understood; while others read, he could generally go to sleep; he was obliged to hear frequently and at length that 'firstly, it was thus, and secondly, it was thus', and to have it laboriously proved to him, that it is clear, when it is day, while the sun was shining through the window. Then he could go quietly home,

with nothing to think about or to write out in the evening, nothing to read to his teacher, nothing to repeat from memory; no expressions to be searched for, no synonyms to be employed as an ornament, no translation from Greek into Latin. What could be gained by a course of study such as that?' But, as Fronto says, Marcus would rather converse than be eloquent, and preferred to express himself in whispers and murmurs than in distinct utterances.

Lucian also, in spite of all his ill-humour with the degenerate rhetoric of his time; in spite of his letter of renunciation addressed to it in his *Bis Accusatus* ('Twice Accused'), written when he was nearly forty years of age; in spite of his pretended conversion to philosophy, remained at heart a genuine rhetorician, and, like Quintilian, denies the claims of speculation from the standpoint of sound common sense.

According to him, also, philosophy consisted of the practical worldly wisdom, which was not only tied to no system, but was attainable by every thinking man, even if not a philosopher. In general, philosophers were hateful to him, although he made some exceptions (belonging to the most different schools); and not only by reason of the contrast between their doctrine and their manner of life. The vanity, folly, unreality and absurdity of all philosophical studies form the subject of the dialogue *Hermotimus*. Hermotimus, who has been absorbed for the last twenty years in the study of Stoicism, never misses a lecture, pores over his books day and night, has no enjoyments, looks pale and thin, hopes in another twenty years to reach his goal! But he is finally obliged to admit that, in order to be able to assert that any one system of philosophy is the only one that can bestow happiness, it would be necessary first to examine all existing systems, which would take two hundred or at least a hundred years. And what certainty is there that truth is really contained in any one system? And even if one succeeded in discovering the only true philosophy, how could one be sure of finding the right person to teach it? And, after all, the efforts of those who study philosophy are not even directed towards its proper aim, the practical demonstration of knowledge in actions, but rather towards miserable 'phrasicles',[1]

[1] Liddell and Scott, *s.v.* ῥημάτιον.

syllogisms, false conclusions, and puzzling questions; their masters' cleverness in confounding others with sophisms is the object of their profound admiration. Instead of striving after the fruit, they work themselves to death for the rind and throw the leaves in each other's faces.

Lastly, Aristides evidently thought that he was fulfilling a sacred duty, imposed upon him by his position in the literary world, when in the struggle between rhetoric and philosophy he threw the whole weight of his authority on the side of the former. In two lengthy discourses *On Rhetoric* he defends it against the accusations of the Platonic Socrates (in the *Gorgias*). Rhetoric is not only (what is there denied) an art, but is indissolubly connected with all the cardinal virtues; it has been invented by wisdom for the sake of justice, and is protected by bravery and virtue; he who knows how a man should speak, also knows how he should act; in short, the art of oratory is the foundation and summary of all moral and intellectual education. Certainly, Aristides declares that he has no intention of attacking philosophy itself; he has associated with the best and greatest philosophers of his time and looks upon them as his instructors. But, as a matter of fact, these conventional commendations conceal a strong dislike, even a certain hatred, of philosophy. Aristides also defends the four great Athenian statesmen, Miltiades, Themistocles, Cimon and Pericles against the accusations of Platonic idealism in an excessively long discourse, in which he empties all the vials of his wrath upon the philosophers of the time. Even if one can put up with such unjust accusations from the great Plato, it is intolerable that utterly worthless individuals should have the audacity to imitate him and even to insult a Demosthenes. Who would endure such men's abuse even of the living, 'men whose grammatical faults outnumber their words, who look down upon others with the contempt which they merit themselves, who test others but never themselves, who praise virtue but do not practise it'? They have never, like the rhetoricians, delivered, imagined or composed a profitable speech, have never contributed to the brilliancy of festivals, have never paid honour to the gods, have never given counsel to cities, have never consoled the afflicted, have never reconciled those at variance, have never admonished the young or any one

else, have never thought of embellishing their speeches. But, creeping into their holes, they excogitate their glorious wisdom, 'ranting to some creature of their brain'[1], reaping ears of corn,[2] tying ropes of sand', and undoing I know not what web; for the more they gain in wisdom, the more they lose; highly pleased with themselves if they speak evil of rhetoric; somewhat after the manner of slaves, especially those who are always being flogged, they curse their masters between their teeth, or like a satyr on the stage, who curses Heracles and hides himself at his approach. However, it is quite natural that they should speak ill of everybody, for they have enough bad language and to spare; and even if they do not specially mention any one, they none the less speak evil, when they do speak; in so doing they are only giving of their own superfluity. If they were deprived of the power of lying and acting maliciously, their occupation would be gone. And with it all, they hold before the world the glorious name of philosophy as a show-piece; as if the name meant anything, as if Thersites could be beautiful if he were called Hyacinthus or Narcissus, or as if the name of Nestor could make a Margites wise?

For the reasons above indicated a large number of people, belonging to different classes of society, took up an attitude of dislike or positive hostility to philosophy; Roman patriots, conservatives by conviction, instinct or interestedness; men of the ordinary kind, who were uncomfortably affected by everything that rose above mediocrity; those who detested pretentiousness; selfish utilitarians; those who opposed and despised every kind of speculation; representatives of non-philosophical education, all strove to defend their own interests and property. It appeared to all of these that they could not more effectually support their opinion of philosophy as superfluous, valueless or even injurious, than by appealing to experience, which taught, so at least they asserted, that the standard of morality as a rule was no higher among philosophers, if indeed it was not lower, than amongst the majority of average men.

[1] Sophocles, *Ajax*, 302 (Jebb's tr.).
[2] i.e. attempting impossibilities. Ἀνθέρικον ('blade' or 'ear' of corn) is used in later Greek for the stalks of the asphodel plant, and this may be the meaning here, in reference to a plant that cannot be reaped.

Hence the name of philosopher subjected every one who assumed it to a keen, unsparing and jealous observation from various critics, who eagerly strove to discover his offences, weaknesses, and absurdities, that they might triumphantly denounce them. Epictetus says: When people see a man with long hair and a coarse cloak behaving in an unseemly manner, they shout, 'Look at the philosopher'; whereas his behaviour should rather convince them that he is no philosopher. When Gellius was crossing from Cassiope to Brundisium, a fearful storm endangered the safety of the ship. While every one was wailing and lamenting, Gellius looked round at a famous Stoic philosopher who happened to be on board, to get an idea of his state of mind from his demeanour. The philosopher, it is true, uttered no complaint, but betrayed his alarm by his paleness and the expression of his features. When the storm had subsided, a wealthy Asiatic Greek, who was travelling with a large suite and a luxurious equipment, immediately went up to the Stoic and ridiculed him for having turned pale in the hour of danger. The philosopher met this impertinence admirably; he removed Gellius' modestly expressed doubt on the same point by quoting a passage in Epictetus, according to which even the wise man was allowed to turn pale.

It may be conjectured that philosophers most frequently had to justify themselves against the charge of being fond of money. Ulpian, in discussing processes for fees owing for lessons or other services rendered by learned men, says that, in his opinion, philosophers could not legally prosecute claims for fees; they had above all to declare that they disdained all 'salaried employment'. On the other hand, Seneca, in a lengthy treatise, attempted to prove that there was no law against philosophers being wealthy. Certainly he does not expect to convince those, who cannot admit that any one is morally good, since they regard another man's virtue as a reproach to themselves, and who hate the very name of virtue and every one who practises it; according to them, even the Cynic Demetrius is not poor enough. No doubt philosophers as a rule are far from attaining their ideals, which are beyond human powers; but is it not praiseworthy ever to have their mind fixed upon them and to strive to reach the goal? He himself lays no claim to the name

of a wise man; he is only an earnest inquirer after truth, not to be compared with the best, but better than the bad, and content to walk steadily in the way of moral perfection. Wealth is one of the 'indifferent' things (ἀδιάφορα, *media*, *indifferentia*), which are not entirely without value; the philosopher, although he does not love it, yet prefers it to poverty, since it enables him to develop a number of good qualities, such as moderation, generosity, carefulness, orderliness, magnanimity. Even Cato of Utica, who praised the poverty of the good old days, had a fortune of 4,000,000 sesterces (about £40,000); Seneca himself one of 300,000,000 (£3,000,000). It is obvious that such apologies for contradictions between theory and practice, between the ideal and the real, could make but little impression on those who opposed philosophy on principle, especially as philosophers only too often were guilty of worse offences. Seneca confesses that some of them might be charged with gluttony, keeping mistresses and accepting presents. Such men could be found living in adultery, haunting the taverns and hanging about at court. And every unworthy or shameful act committed by one was a slur upon his school as a whole. The treacherous conduct of the Stoic Publius Egnatius Celer towards his patron Barea Soranus in the year 66, was fresh in men's memory a generation later, and was quoted as an example of the 'shameful deeds of the great cloak'.[1]

But if philosophers of means were reproached for their wealth, it was said of the poor that their lofty ideas cost them little. The Stoic Chaeremon, says Martial, claims to be admired for his contempt of death. What gives him this fortitude is his utter poverty; he has nothing he can call his own save a broken pitcher, a hearth without a fire, a mattress, a bug, a bare pallet, and a short *toga*, which serves him as a covering by night. What a great man he is, to have the courage to give up sour wine, black bread and a litter of straw! If only he were living in the enjoyment of wealth and luxury, he would want to live three times as long as Nestor and to enjoy every moment of his life. It is easy enough to despise life when poor; the man who knows how

[1] Juvenal, iii. 115. The phrase, *facinus majoris abollae*, seems to mean 'a greater crime', although the explanation is doubtful. *Abolla* was a thick cloak worn by philosophers, and may be used to represent the class.

to endure unhappiness is really courageous. Appian says that whenever philosophers have attained to power, they have exercised it more harshly than uneducated tyrants, and thereby aroused suspicion and doubts of other philosophers, whether they have embraced philosophy for the sake of virtue or only as a consolation for poverty and indolence. Even at the present day, he says, there are many, poor and with nothing to do, who, wrapping themselves in the cloak of the wisdom of necessity, bitterly assail the rich or highly placed; but, instead of gaining a reputation for contempt of wealth and power, they are looked upon as envious of both. Those who are abused would do well to ignore them.

As the number of philosophers increased and their society consequently became more mixed, the feeling of dislike for them became more pronounced and attacks upon them more frequent. It is one of the symptoms of the continual progress of philosophy in Rome in the second half of the first century that, from the time of Domitian at least, hypocrites frequently used it as a mask, under the shelter of which they hoped to be able to sin with impunity. On several occasions Quintilian inveighs bitterly against those humbugs who, having attended philosophical lectures for a certain time, with their hypocritical airs and long beards and by their professed contempt for others manage to obtain a great reputation; in public they appear stern and gloomy, while at home they indulge in gross excesses. It is men such as these who make the name of philosophy hated, which in his time was used as a cloak for the greatest vices and the worst infamies. Thus the highly gifted, but morally weak Palfurius Sura (who carried on the profession of an informer under Domitian and was condemned to death on that account immediately after Nerva's accession) joined the Stoic school after he had been expelled from the senate by Vespasian. Needy Stoics and Cynics with huge dusty beards were common sights in Rome at that time; during the reigns of Domitian and Trajan every district of the city swarmed with sulky-looking profligates, who pretended to be Curii but whose life as a matter of fact was a succession of orgies. These men also excited the dislike of honourable people by their ignorance, in spite of the numerous plaster busts of Chrysippus and other philosophers with which they adorned

their book shelves. For all they said, they might have been dumb; they wore their hair even shorter than their eyebrows; yet more than one of these Stoics, who like fresh Catos declaimed against the decadence of morality in their time, betrayed their luxurious habits by the exquisite perfumes with which they rubbed their scrubby necks.

The number of philosophers and pseudo-philosophers in the capital of the world was already so great, and even amidst the motley, ever seething crowd their behaviour so conspicuous, that they attracted general attention and criticism. How much more must this have been the case in the quietness of provincial life, so favourable to contemplation, in a country like Greece, which then, as formerly, was the true home of philosophy and philosophers, and remained so till the end of ancient civilization. Dio of Prusa (in the passages above cited) declares that the philosopher's cloak is to be seen everywhere; that the number of those who wear it is almost greater than that of the shoemakers or fullers or jesters or the followers of any other profession; but, he adds, even though we wear the dress of Socrates or Diogenes we still remain far behind them in wisdom. But even if philosophy occupied so large a space in the civilized life of Greece at that time, the number of true philosophers remained small; the majority, as Epictetus says, were philosophers in words only, not in reality; but its opponents still continued to point to the conduct of these philosophers, philosophers only by virtue of their beard and cloak, in order to represent the uselessness of philosophy as an aid to moral perfection.

Pseudo-philosophy, together with philosophy, obtained the widest recognition under Marcus Aurelius. At Rome true philosophers, such as Macedo the friend of Gellius, complained that idlers with beards and cloaks explained away the content of philosophy in sophistic language and delivered eloquent sermons against vices, with which they inwardly reeked themselves. In Africa Apuleius (under Antoninus Pius) expressed the hope that every one would not be permitted to assume the mask of philosophy, so that uncouth, dirty, uneducated men might not be able to sully the royal science, which taught noble speaking and noble living, by their evil words and equally evil manner of life. The prominence

he gives to impudent abuse and vulgarity in manners and outward appearance as the chief characteristics of these spurious philosophers, clearly shows that he was thinking particularly or exclusively of the Cynics, who in his opinion were far inferior to the Platonists. In Greece, especially, according to Lucian, in all the streets and public places were to be seen long beards, book-rolls, worn-out cloaks, and enormous sticks in abundance; shoemakers and carpenters left their workshops, to carry on an idle beggar's life as Cynics. The degradation of philosophy by the gang of false disciples, the abuse of its name which especially embittered those who were not philosophers, naturally strengthened the ranks of its opponents and played into their hands. Lucian made it his special task to hold up the ways of these men to the scorn of his contemporaries. They, the men who taught contempt for money and fame and dispassionateness, who praised virtue as the only good, taught for money, grovelled before the rich, were more passionate than snarling dogs, more cowardly than hares, more fawning than apes, more brutal than asses, more thievish than weasels, more quarrelsome than cocks. Added to this, every school abused the other. The Stoics called the Epicureans voluptuaries, the Peripatetics quarrelsome and avaricious, the Platonists arrogant and ambitious, being in turn reproached with usury, contentiousness and other vices. When the followers of the different schools quarrelled there was no infamy of which they did not accuse one another. When some of them appealed to the old philosophers in extenuation of their vices, as the Platonists justified adultery by Plato's *Republic* and drunkenness by his *Laws*, it was no wonder that many declared outright that the exclusive and absorbing study of philosophical books only led men astray from intelligent thinking.

Aristides also, in the discourse already quoted, passing from the defence to the attack, represented philosophers as a class of men destitute of all virtue and affected with all vices. They declare themselves not inferior to Zeus, but cannot resist 'the obol'. They abuse others out of pure envy; but if one were to offer them, in the middle of their lectures on abstinence, a piece of cake or pastry, they would let their tongue drop, like Menelaus his sword, when he first saw Helen. But if they were to see Helen, or only a

servant like the Phrygian handmaiden in Menander, the behaviour of the satyrs in Sophocles would seem a harmless joke in comparison. In order to understand their untrustworthiness and greed, it is not necessary to entrust anything to their care; for they everywhere lay hands upon everything they can. They call robbery division of property, envy a philosophical frame of mind, poverty contempt of money. They pride themselves on their philanthropy, but have never yet done any one a service; on the contrary, they injure those who have anything to do with them. While they pretend not to see people, even when they meet them, they travel to foreign parts in search of the rich, like the Phrygians after the olive crop; they scent their approach at once, seize hold of them at once, and promise to impart virtue to them. They hardly give a civil answer, when spoken to by other people; but they salute from a distance the cooks, bakers and other servants of the wealthy even before they have recognized them, as if they had got out of bed for that purpose. They crowd before the doors of wealthy houses and mix with the porters more than with their masters, bolstering up their servility with effrontery. When any one sees them for the first time, they show less scruple in demanding what is not their due than others in claiming what is theirs by right. For they are the people who call effrontery frankness, malignity sincerity, spoliation philanthropy. Certainly they do not ask for money, but they know how to take it. If any one sends them too little, they stick to their principles; but if they catch sight of a well-filled purse, then Perseus has overcome the Gorgon; the excuse is very artful: 'the wife and the little ones'. Their definition of greatness of soul is, in fact, quite new; that it does not consist in giving much, but in not accepting little. Some have already made it a rule never to refuse a gift, and to abuse the giver after they have received it. While they play the hypocrite like the parasites and ape the insolence of their superiors, they exhibit, like the atheists in Palestine, two most opposite faults, humility and arrogance. Like the atheists, they are far inferior to the Greeks (at least, those of the better class), and in everything else are as mute as their own shadow; except that if it is a question of abuse and calumny, one would be inclined to compare them, not

with the gong at Dodona but with flies buzzing in the dark. No one is so incapable of co-operating in anything that is needful; on the other hand, they understand better than any one else how to play the spy on a household and to bring confusion into it, how to set the inmates against each other, and how to declare that they themselves could manage things much better.

The name of philosophy was chiefly brought into contempt by the gang of Cynics, whose name and school, after long suspension, revived at the beginning of the Christian era. Even amongst them there were some noble figures; but, in the second century especially, Cynicism became more and more a 'sign-board, which concealed a host of impure elements', and the majority of these 'mendicant friars' of antiquity a veritable pest, at least in Greece, through their vulgarity, repulsiveness, and effrontery. A caricature of Diogenes and Antisthenes in outward appearance, dress, manner of life and conduct,—this was the only manifestation of a moral freedom based upon absence of wants, renunciation of the world and superiority to all human weaknesses, which found favour with only too many, who might be recognized as Cynics by the tattered cloak or simple bearskin, unkempt hair and beard, staff (occasionally even a pestle) and wallet. Their cosmopolitanism, without a home, degenerated into vagrancy, their return to a state of nature into disgusting obscenity, which Epictetus thought it his duty to prove, in a special essay, was no necessity for a philosopher. Their lack of means was bound to be used as a pretext for impudent mendicancy and low toadyism; their self-appointed mission as educators of backward humanity and physicians of its infirmities as a justification for importunity and charlatanry; their coarse vulgarity, which took the place of robust humour, as a seasoning for the sermons of these ancient capuchins.

This repulsive portrait, drawn in detail by Lucian, is also found in other authors. Petronius says that even those who spend their time with the Cynic wallet, sometimes sell the truth for money. Epictetus contrasts the ideal Cynic with 'those of the present day, the dogs round the master's table', who imitated Diogenes only in his most unmannerly unceremoniousness, whose only claim to Cynicism was their

staff and wallet, lanthorn jaws, their pilfering and pocketing, vulgar abuse and exhibition of their broad shoulders. On one occasion, when Gellius was with Herodes Atticus, one of these beggars, with long hair and a beard hanging below his navel, approached him and held out his hand with a request for money 'to buy bread'. When asked who he was, he rudely replied, 'a philosopher, as any one could tell by looking at me'. One of the companions of Herodes remarked that he was a vagrant and a ne'er-do-well, who went the round of dirty taverns, and insulted those who did not give him anything. Herodes, however, ordered money enough to buy bread for a month to be given him. Nor is there any reason, consequently, to doubt the statement of Lucian that runaway slaves and ne'er-do-wells, who found it too much trouble to earn a livelihood in a respectable trade, chose this convenient and lucrative beggar's life, which at the same time made it possible for them to indulge their bestial inclinations under the philosopher's mask. Everywhere they levied contributions or, in their words, sheared the sheep with complete success, for most people gave out of respect for their venerable dress or from fear of their abuse; and Lucian asserts that not only were gold pieces, mirrors, perfumes and dice sometimes found in their wallets, but that many made enough by begging to buy land and houses and live in luxury.

Consequently, although antipathies of all kinds existed, well-founded or not, partly against philosophy itself and partly against philosophers, in the most different social and educational circles in both the Greek and the Roman world, yet obviously the great majority of educated persons in Rome and the western countries were thoroughly convinced that philosophy was the best guide to the highest morality. Indeed, the opposition hitherto described, many sided and vigorous, even violent, is inconceivable unless this opinion was widely held; rather it assumes it. Cicero may be regarded as the representative of the view which in later Roman antiquity reckoned the greatest number of supporters. According to him, there would be no need of philosophy at all, if the germs of virtue implanted in us by nature were able to develop themselves undisturbed. But since we are under the influence of false and perverted ideas from our birth,

imbibe them with our mother's milk, and are increasingly infected with errors by parents, teachers, poets, and finally by the people amongst whom we live, we need a cure for our ailing and ill-trained souls; and this cure, the restoration of our natural health, we can obtain by means of philosophy alone.

The weight of the universally recognized authority of Cicero, who in his *Hortensius* appears as an advocate of philosophy against rhetoric, could least of all be denied by those who recognized in eloquence the aim and sum-total of all education. Even Quintilian, the enemy of philosophers, who is inclined to treat philosophy as the handmaid of eloquence, recognizes that no one can be morally good without the teaching of virtue and justice. The assertion that virtue can be acquired without teaching, he hardly thinks worth refutation. His ideal orator, after the completion of a comprehensive technical education, should go through an equally comprehensive course of instruction in philosophy—physics (natural philosophy), dialectics and ethics. His remark that he should be a philosopher, who will have to prove himself a truly good citizen, not by school disputations, but by acts and positive evidence of purpose, reminds us that the greatest differences of opinion prevailed in the Roman world, even amongst those who recognized the necessity or utility of philosophy, not only as to its aims, but also as to the amount of philosophical instruction that was desirable. Tacitus voices the unbending attitude of the Romans in regard to the study of philosophy as taught by the Greek schools, that it should be limited to a minimum. On the other hand, it is sufficient to mention names like Seneca, Persius, Musonius Rufus and Marcus Aurelius, to prove that the demand for entire devotion to philosophy had its representatives also in the educated Roman world. Philosophy, says Seneca, cannot be treated as an extra. It is an exacting mistress, who refuses to accept a man's leisure time, and claims to decide how much leisure he shall have. But if a man devotes all his time to it, concentrates all his thoughts upon it, and refuses to attend to anything else, he will far outstrip all other men and will not be far inferior to the gods. Philosophy is not intended to be an agreeable recreation during the day, a means of dissipating the *ennui* of the idler; it culti-

vates and forms the mind, regulates life, directs our actions, shows what should be done and what left undone, sits at the helm and steers safely through the waves. Without philosophy no one can be free from fear, no one can live without anxiety; events without number occur every hour which demand advice, which must be sought from philosophy. In two very lengthy essays Seneca discusses the question (often debated), whether the paraenetic section of moral philosophy, i.e. a practical teaching of duty, containing precepts for all important contingencies, is sufficient for life; or whether such teaching must be based upon a theoretical system of principles or dogmas, which prescribe the rule of action in all particular cases. While some declared the paraenetic, others the dogmatic section to be superfluous, Seneca endeavours to show that a complete and true moral education can only be obtained by the combination of both. A conviction founded on principles must be the basis and source of all thoughts and actions, which must be directed towards a fixed goal, the highest good, as far as it is possible to reach it, as the course of ships is guided by a star. Without such conviction founded upon dogmatic principles, an invariable constancy in thought and action is impossible; it is also the soil, on which alone the maxims of moral philosophy take root, from which alone they can draw renewed vitality. But, in addition to the general principles of the one, the special rules of the other are equally indispensable. Surrounded by perverted ideas, by errors of every kind, by lies and pretence, we require to be incessantly reminded of even well-known truths; amidst the tumult of falsehood we need the warning voice of admonition, amidst the roar of cities a prompter by our side, to teach us, in opposition to the panegyrists of wealth, power and favour, to appreciate peaceful devotion to study and the return of the mind from the external world to itself. Philosophy alone can give us a healthy mind; it is the only teacher of the highest art, the art of living, and not only the best, but the only guide to morality. There is no virtue without philosophy, no philosophy without virtue.

One who required such complete devotion to philosophy as Seneca was naturally difficult to satisfy in the matter of the zeal and number of its disciples. About the year 64,

he complains that no one troubles himself about philosophy, except when the games are put off or on a rainy day, when he wants to kill time; the philosophical schools, like the rhetorical, are empty. Yet these complaints of a writer who is always given to exaggeration prove at the most that his ideal remained unrealized. The banishment of Musonius Rufus in 65, who, as Tacitus says, owed his exile to his reputation, since he exercised great influence on the education of the young by introducing them to philosophy, shows that, as a matter of fact, philosophy at that time had many zealous disciples amongst the youth of the upper classes. Naturally, the number of pupils of that class must have been large, to have aroused the attention and suspicion of the Neronian régime.

Amongst the philosophers who taught in Rome and other cities of the West (especially Massilia, one of the chief seats of such studies even in Strabo's time), Greeks certainly formed the majority. That philosophy was regarded as a Greek science is also shown by the fact that many philosophers who were not Greeks, such as the two Sextii, Cornutus, Musonius Rufus, Favorinus, Marcus Aurelius, and to some extent Apuleius, wrote in Greek. The extent to which it had become naturalized in Rome as early as the last century B.C. is shown not only by the large number of followers, admirers and patrons, which it secured in the educated society of Rome, and by the rise of a Roman philosophical literature, but above all by the formation of the philosophical school of the Sextii. It was certainly only a form of Stoicism, as it took shape in the Roman consciousness, especially in the sense that it was distinctly limited to moral philosophy, with a dash of asceticism borrowed from Pythagoreanism (such as abstention from animal food). Since, therefore, it coincided in the main with the Stoicism and Cynicism of the first century, it lacked the fundamental condition of an independent existence; it was soon dissolved, and its pupils, like Seneca, returned to the great Stoic community from which the Sextii had separated. During its existence, however, the school had important representatives, and exercised considerable influence. Its founder was Quintus Sextius, a man of good family, who contemptuously declined the offer of Julius Caesar to raise him to senatorial rank

and launch him on an official career, in order to devote himself entirely to philosophy. Other important members of the school were the son of the founder, the prolific writer Cornelius Celsus, the learned grammarian Lucius Crassitius of Tarentum, who sacrificed his important teaching connexion to join the school, and Papirius Fabianus, whom Seneca, when a young man, had heard and highly appreciated. He calls him a true philosopher of the old style, not one of the modern professors, although at the same time he praises his public lectures. One felt elevated by his exhortations and incited to emulation, without losing the hope of even surpassing him ; and although as a rule his hearers preserved a modest silence, they were now and again carried away to enthusiastic applause by the nobility of his sentiments.

Of all the systems of Greek moral philosophy Stoicism was undoubtedly best suited to the Roman national character, and for this reason always had the greatest number of followers amongst those Romans who seriously aspired to moral perfection. The long list of prominent personalities in Roman history, whom we know as Stoics, contains the noblest figures of that time, and not a few who by their life and death have proved the earnestness and sincerity of the convictions they had acquired from the Stoic system of philosophy. The philosophical works of the Roman writers of this period that have been preserved also belong almost exclusively to this school. Next to Stoicism, Epicureanism probably at all times reckoned the greatest number of adherents, although there is no positive evidence of its spread in the Roman world under the empire. That the Epicureans did not make themselves prominent in public life was due to the nature of their school, which purposely sought concealment ; and there was the less need for them to assert the claims of their system in writing, since these were sufficiently set forth in earlier works.

The remaining philosophical schools had undoubtedly made less progress amongst the Romans, but probably none of them was without its representatives ; and it was a natural result of the eclectic tendency of the Romans that each aroused interest and proved attractive even outside the circle of its own followers. The lectures delivered in Rome

by the Platonist Plutarch during the reign of Domitian were attended by the most important men in the city, several of whom became firm friends of the venerable philosopher. Such were Mestrius Florus (already a consular in 69); Sossius Senecio (consul 98, 99, 102), to whom Plutarch dedicated his *Lives*; Fundanus, a pupil of Musonius (probably identical with Minucius Fundanus, consul 107); Terentius Priscus (perhaps the same as Martial's patron), and others. Gellius, who regularly attended the lectures of the famous Platonist Calvisius Taurus at Athens, was one of a large number of Romans who studied in that city, who all attended the same lectures. We shall speak later of the position of the Cynic Demetrius at Rome during the period from Nero to Vespasian. The Cynic Crescens, whose slanders on the Christians were publicly refuted by Justin at Rome, is said to have brought about the persecution and execution of the latter. The Cynic Theagenes, a zealous adherent of Peregrinus Proteus, who according to Galen died in consequence of being wrongly treated by the physician Attalus (a pupil of Soranus), 'an ass of the sect of Thessalus', was a very well-known figure at Rome, where he daily held discussions in the *thermae* of Trajan. A large number of the friends of Theagenes accompanied Attalus, who desired to convince them of his convalescence, to the philosopher's house; on their arrival, they found some Cynics and other philosophers engaged in washing the body of the deceased, who, according to the principles of his school, had neither household nor servants. Galen laid the foundation of his reputation at Rome in the year 162, by restoring the sixty-three year old Peripatetic Eudemus to health. During his illness, Eudemus was visited by 'nearly all those distinguished by birth and education', especially Sergius Paullus (consul about 150 and 168), also city praefect, 'a man distinguished by philosophical education and behaviour', and the consular Flavius Boethus, a zealous student of Aristotelian philosophy. The latter, as well as Civica Barbarus (consul 157), uncle of Lucius Verus, and Severus (consul 162, also an Aristotelian) had Galen to lecture to them on anatomy. These lectures were attended by a number of philosophers, amongst them the Peripatetic Alexander of Damascus, more of an Aristotelian than a Platonist, in 162 teacher of Boethus, and about 175

a public teacher in Athens ; and by Demetrius of Alexandria, a friend of Favorinus, who every day spoke in public on given subjects after the manner of his teacher. Favorinus himself, who was a sceptic, was in great favour with Hadrian, under whom and his successor he gathered round him a large number of pupils and admirers, some of high rank. Gellius, who was one of his chief adherents, mentions as his friends a Peripatetic and a Stoic, 'both distinguished philosophers at Rome'; a Peripatetic, a diligent student of Aristotle, was also a member of a learned society, with which Gellius once spent the hottest part of the summer at Tibur. Fronto recommends the Platonist Julius Aquilinus, whose lectures were the most crowded in Rome and attended by many of senatorial rank, to Quintus Aegrilius Plarianus (legate of Africa under Antoninus Pius) as a friend and student of philosophy. Apuleius (about 158) praises Claudius Maximus, proconsul of Africa, as acquainted with the works of Plato in the original. Alexander of Aphrodisias (between 198 and 211) in the dedication of a treatise expresses his thanks to the emperors Severus and Caracalla for his nomination or appointment as teacher of the philosophy of Aristotle in Rome, and declares that they truly honoured and encouraged philosophy. The first Gordian, according to his biographer, spent all his life in the society of the ancients, Plato and Aristotle, Cicero and Virgil.

These references to philosophical studies in Rome, numerous in comparison with our scanty knowledge of the intellectual conditions of the time, and other incidental statements (for example, that in Trajan's time the dialogues of Plato were represented at meals to amuse the guests), justify the assumption that, from the end of the first century, a lively and comprehensive interest in philosophy was common amongst the upper classes. Further, Porphyry's account of the success of Plotinus in Rome shows that this interest still continued as late as the end of the third century.

As a rule, a young man did not begin the philosophical course until he had completed his grammatical and rhetorical studies. Gellius, who spent an unusually long time on the latter, did not turn his attention to philosophy until his twenty-fifth year ; on the other hand, Marcus Aurelius began philosophy unusually early, at the age of twelve. The majority of

young men probably entered the school, which was to bring about the moral emancipation of its pupils and make them men in the highest sense of the word, at the time of the assumption of the *toga virilis* (i.e. when they came to man's estate). Persius, who laid aside the *bulla* [1] and dress of a boy at the age of sixteen, now that the white *toga* [2] allowed him to cast his eyes freely around amidst the distracting turmoil of Rome, keenly felt the need of a trusty guide, to choose for him the right way in the mazes of the labyrinth of life; accordingly he attached himself most closely to Cornutus. Seneca also was little more than a boy when he attended the school of Sotion of Alexandria, who belonged to the sect of the Sextii. Plutarch sent his essay *De Audiendo* (On the Art of Hearing) to a young friend, with the reminder that when he assumed the *toga virilis* he had passed out of the care of his former paid teachers and had come under the divine guidance of reason; that philosophy alone was able to bestow the true and perfect ornament of man upon a youth.

In all probability the majority of young men continued regularly to attend philosophical lectures until they had homes of their own, although Plutarch refused to recognize the worries and occupations of housekeeping as a sufficient excuse for neglecting what was of far greater importance. In fact, it was by no means unusual for older and married men to attend a philosophical school; Seneca was sixty years of age when he heard the philosopher Metronax in Naples. He writes to Lucilius that he has now been attending the school for five days, to hear Metronax at midday. Age, he says, is no bar to attendance; why should I be ashamed of listening to a philosopher? Certainly the school is not well patronized, whereas the theatre, where musical contests take place at the same time, is crowded, and the pupils of Metronax are laughed at as fools and idlers.

Philosophical instruction was confined to the three divisions of philosophy recognized by all the schools—logic, physic, and ethics. Only the Platonists at that time as a rule appear to have also included the study of mathematics. In their studies were to be seen tablets with geometrical figures drawn upon

[1] See note on p. 13.
[2] The colour of the toga worn by men (*virilis*) was generally white (*candida*).

them, globes, etc.; in their lecture-rooms the pupils showed their desire for knowledge by putting difficult mathematical questions. In the Stoic school of the time, as to which we have most information, the course as a rule began with logic (and dialectic), although the Stoic authorities are not agreed as to the order of subjects. Seneca calls logic the ' elementary school ' of philosophers. Stoicism and philosophy at that time generally made ethics the chief subject and aim of instruction, so that the two other divisions were not only subordinate to it, but were to some extent regarded as superfluous. Nevertheless, men like Musonius Rufus and Epictetus, although they may have considered moral education to be the one and only aim of philosophy, and took little interest in logical and dialectical discussions, still held logic to be indispensable as a foundation for the study of philosophy. Those who devoted themselves to oratory were of course still more convinced that it was necessary and useful for a general scientific education.

This subject, in spite of its dryness, was the more attractive to men of keen intellect, especially if they were given to quibbling, since it was easy to obtain a brilliant reputation by a skilful use of logical forms in discussions and on other occasions. When a man has once taken up this science, so repulsive at first, its usefulness soon becomes more and more apparent; there arises an insatiable desire for learning, which must be checked, otherwise a man would be in danger of spending his life in the labyrinthine mazes of dialectic, which is as fatal as the islands of the Sirens. The worst thing about sophisms, says Seneca, is that they exercise a certain charm and arrest and fascinate the mind, which is seduced by the appearance of acuteness, while a number of more important things calls for our attention. A lifetime is hardly long enough to learn the one thing which is the aim of philosophy—how to despise life. Such fancies and aspirations were freely encouraged by a voluminous literature, to which the older Stoics, who specially cultivated this field, had contributed. There were special treatises devoted to individual captious syllogisms, the only object of which was to confuse; such were the *sorites* (how many grains of corn make a heap ?), the *Cornutus* (have you lost your horns : if not, you still have them ; if you have, you once had them), and the like. Such witticisms, worthy

of the Talmud, were frequently taken seriously, and the young especially spent much time over them. All beginners in philosophy, says Plutarch, devote themselves by preference to what brings reputation; some, heedless and ambitious, soar like birds to the brilliant heights of the speculations of natural philosophy; others devote their attention to discussions, embarrassing questions and sophisms, just as (to use Plato's expression) puppies take delight in pulling something to pieces and dragging it about; the majority, however, are absorbed in dialectic, to provide themselves with the necessary equipment for sophistic. The teachers, as Seneca says, 'who teach us the art of arguing instead of the art of living', unfortunately are only too ready to encourage these erroneous tendencies of their pupils, who want to form their mind, not their character. Thus philosophy has become a science of words (philology). As the result of adopting what is superfluous in philosophy and mathematics, philosophy understands the art of speaking better than the art of living. Philosophers and non-philosophers were united in the complaint that too much time and trouble were spent on logic and dialectic, which were only the outworks of wisdom, and that ethics suffered thereby. Epictetus, for example, says: At the present time the greatest industry is successfully expended on the reduction of syllogisms; whereas formerly it was expended on keeping the best part of the mind in its natural condition, and with equal success.

In the Stoic school, especially, the efforts of many students were directed more or less exclusively to the acquirement of a superior knowledge of the technicalities of dialectic and a thorough acquaintance with the literature of the subject. The pedants who still attended or had only just left school, who wanted to teach to-day what they had learnt yesterday, and 'vomited undigested morsels', pretended to know everything better than anyone else, and copied their teachers chiefly in their cocksureness and love of finding fault, frequently appear in the writings of the second century as the undesirable disturbers of conversation in Greek society. As Epictetus says, there were people who attended philosophical lectures and studied text-books with the sole object of exciting the admiration of a senator, who happened to sit next them at table, or of astonishing the guests by enumerating all the

authors who had written on a certain form of logical conclusion. When visiting Herodes Atticus in his villa on the Cephissus, Gellius met a very youthful, loquacious and noisy Stoic, who usually monopolized the conversation after dinner and delivered lengthy and insipid lectures on philosophy, about which he declared that he knew more than all other Greeks and Romans. He made free use of strange expressions, syllogisms and captious conclusions, and boasted that no one could equal him in solving dialectical problems; that no one was as perfectly at home with moral philosophy as he was; that he felt so thoroughly confident that he possessed the true wisdom which guaranteed eternal happiness, that he declared that no pain or grief could so much as bring a cloud upon the face of a Stoic. To take the conceit out of him Herodes thereupon ordered a passage to be read from Epictetus, in which that venerable old man rebukes the young, who call themselves Stoics, but are in no way distinguished by moral excellence or capacity; on the contrary, they have always on their lips puerile maxims, such as are to be found in elementary school books, and misuse the name of that lofty doctrine by raising a cloud of words and subtleties before the eyes of their hearers.

Natural philosophy (physics) was too intimately connected with ethics not to be taken into consideration with it, at least to a certain extent. It was felt that the question of Providence could only be really solved together with the question of the origin of things and the order of the universe. The more attention was concentrated, onesidedly and exclusively, upon the moral task of philosophy, the less could physics be considered; and the opinion of Socrates, that the examination of the last elements and first principles of things was beyond our powers and in any case had no practical value, was probably widely held, and was defended by so high an authority as Epictetus. Seneca also, who was fond of and interested in the speculations of natural science, would only allow their importance in so far as they contributed to moral perfection. The mind, in order to refresh itself, requires to contemplate nature, who enables it to appreciate the loftiness of the objects with which it is concerned. 'In the contemplation of the universe and its creator a man rises superior to the burden of the body; he becomes conscious of his higher origin and

destination ; and learns to attach little value to the body and the corporeal, and to free himself from its trammels. Certainly, however, there is the danger that the mind may come to think more of self-gratification than of health, and may treat philosophy as a simple amusement, whereas in reality it is a means of health '. Plutarch also hints (in the passage above cited), that it was natural philosophy, so stimulating to the imagination, that attracted *dilettanti*, who were only half in earnest about a philosophical education. Propertius proposed to devote himself to it, when he was too old for love affairs. Then, he says, he will endeavour to understand the laws of nature, and the causes of the phases of the moon, of atmospheric variations, of rain, of the rainbow, of earthquakes, of eclipses of the sun, of the phenomena of the starry heaven and of the sea, and of the seasons ; what god skilfully governs this universe, whether a day of destruction menaces the world, whether there is a world below and infernal punishment, or whether death is the end of existence.

But logic and physics were always so completely subordinated to ethics, that the latter was regarded as the essential, if not the only, object of philosophy ; it is called simply the art, the science, the rule of life. Although, after all that has been said, this hardly needs to be proved, perhaps it will not be superfluous to show how the moral training of the young was expected from philosophy alone. In his treatise *On the Education of Boys*, Plutarch says, that as gymnastics and the healing art secure bodily health and strength, so philosophy alone can heal the infirmities and diseases of the mind. By the aid of and in company with philosophy we learn what is noble, what is shameful, what is just, what is unjust, in short, what is to be aimed at and what is to be avoided ; what is to be our attitude towards the gods, our parents, old age, the laws, foreigners, rulers, friends, women, children and slaves ; we learn that we ought to fear the gods, honour our parents, respect old age, obey the laws, submit to our rulers, love our friends, behave with decency towards women, treat children with affection, and slaves without arrogance ; but, above all, that we should neither be too exultant in prosperity nor cast down in adversity ; that we should neither allow ourselves to be overcome by desire nor show ourselves passionate and brutal in wrath. These are the most to be desired of all the

blessings which we obtain through philosophy. Foolish parents, it is said in another passage, who have neglected to give their children a good education, do not as a rule regret this omission until their sons, when grown up, instead of leading a regular and sensible life, plunge into debauchery and low pleasures; surround themselves with parasites and other corrupters of youth, keep women, squander their fortunes in gambling, drinking, and carousing; commit adultery and other excesses, in which they risk their life for the sake of pleasure. Had they enjoyed the advantage of being taught by a philosopher, they would not have given themselves up to such a mode of life. As the husbandman or gardener roots out the tares from the field, so the philosopher roots out from the youthful soul the evil promptings of envy, avarice, and pleasure, even though he has to cut deeply and leave a scar; in other cases, he proceeds with caution, like the vintager when he prunes the vine, so as not to destroy noble and vicious impulses at the same time.

Wherever this conception of philosophical instruction prevailed, wherever the philosopher was regarded not only as the teacher, but chiefly as the trainer, in fact as the spiritual director of his pupils, it was necessarily considered his duty in every way to promote their moral well-being, even beyond the limits of instruction properly so called, and consequently his right to exercise entire supervision over their manner of life, and to put them on the right road by advice and exhortation, warning and reproof, mildness and severity. To all appearance, at that time a large number of prominent men, conscious of the high importance of their office, and equipped with such authority, exercised the greatest moral influence upon entire generations, the more so as pupils flocked even from far distant lands to the most famous teachers (especially at Athens and Rome), who, like Musonius, 'attracted young men from all parts, as the magnet attracts iron'. Some of these young men became intimate with their teachers, and the friendship often far outlasted the years of apprenticeship, sometimes, indeed, continued through life. Thus Persius, from his seventeenth year, was united by the ties of an indissoluble friendship to Cornutus, with whose pupils he became acquainted. Amongst these were the poet Lucan and two Greeks, the physician Claudius Agathemerus of Sparta and

Petronius Aristocrates of Magnesia, both highly educated and pure-minded men, whom Persius took as his models. Cornutus also advised him in his poetical efforts, and was mentioned in his will for a considerable legacy. Persius has expressed, in words full of deep feeling, his gratitude to his beloved master, 'to whom so large a part of his inmost being entirely belonged'. He believed himself united for ever by the destiny of the stars with the man who cherished him in tender years with the affection of a Socrates and moulded his still flexible spirit as the artist the soft clay; he delighted to recall days spent together in work and recreation, and the modest repasts, prolonged till night-fall, which interrupted serious studies. The younger Pliny, when military tribune in Syria, became devotedly attached to the Stoic Artemidorus (who afterwards married a daughter of Musonius Rufus), and protected him in time of danger. When the philosophers were expelled from Rome in the year 93 he lent Artemidorus a considerable sum free of interest to pay certain honourable debts. Even when he attained the rank of consular he looked up to his revered teacher as a pattern. Amongst all those who now call themselves philosophers, writes Pliny in the year 101, you will hardly find another so true and genuine. His endurance of heat and cold, his devotion to work, his limitation of sensual enjoyment to what is strictly necessary, his severe self-discipline—all these are trifles, compared with his other virtues, which induced a Musonius to choose him as a son-in-law out of a number of pupils of all classes of society.

Gellius has drawn an attractive picture of the relation of the Platonist philosopher Taurus to his pupils. Taurus not only allowed them to put frequent questions to him after the daily lesson, but invited those who were more particularly devoted to him to a frugal meal, at which a dish of Egyptian lentils and chopped pumpkin prepared with oil usually formed the chief dish. On these occasions the pupils were obliged to propound questions and problems, as a sort of dessert, especially witticisms suited to those enlivened by wine; e.g. at what moment a dying man really dies, when a man who stands up is no longer sitting down, when a learner begins to understand his profession. Such questions ought not to be despised, says Taurus, since the greatest philosophers had seri-

ously considered them. When his pupils were ill, Taurus used to visit them. According to circumstances, he expressed his disapproval of all that displeased him in their mode of life or study in a tone of friendliness or severity. In order to induce a wealthy young man to abandon the society of flute players and tragic actors, he sent him a copy of a passage from Aristotle on the general moral worthlessness of such artists, which he recommended him to read every day. He severely rebuked another young man, who had suddenly left off the study of rhetoric for that of philosophy, and became exceedingly angry when he attempted to justify his conduct by the example of others. Taurus also took the opportunity of quoting a very beautiful passage of Demosthenes suitable to the occasion. Thus, says Gellius, Taurus made use of every kind of warning and exhortation, to put his disciples on the way of goodness and uprightness. The educative power of his example no doubt had an equal effect. In his account of a visit paid by the governor of Crete and his son to the famous philosopher, Gellius shows that Taurus knew how to preserve his dignity in distinguished society without offending propriety. The Stoic Attalus, who had a school at Rome which was attended by Seneca, who was always the first to come and the last to go, was fond of answering his pupils' questions during a walk. Any one who visited a philosopher (he said) should always take something good home with him; for philosophy has the power of assisting not only those who are devoted to the study of it, but also those who are brought into association with it. Plutarch delivered lectures on the most varied subjects, selected at will, to the young men who were sent from far and near to Chaeronea to be educated by him, and answered the questions they put to him. Some of his later treatises which are preserved to us show that the subjects were taken not only from the entire field of morality, but also from practical philosophy in its widest extent: e.g. On Studying Poetry, On the Art of Hearing, Rules of Health, and so forth.

If philosophers thought it their duty to regulate the life of their pupils even to the minutest details, and to give them instructions even in regard to trivial and apparently indifferent matters (if in any way connected with moral principles), their right to do so was evidently quite generally recognized. Grown

up men, and especially younger men, frequently entrusted themselves to their guidance and rendered them unqualified obedience. As a rule teachers exercised greater authority over grown-up pupils than at the present day. Thus Gellius relates that the rhetorician Titus Castricius rebuked some senators who attended his school, because they had appeared in public on a feast-day in a dress unsuitable to their rank. Of course, philosophers were allowed the widest latitude in giving instructions on all and everything. Attalus recommended his pupils to sleep on a hard bed, such as Seneca used even in his old age, on which the body made no impression. Epictetus exhorted his hearers to let their beard grow, not only as a beautiful and dignified adornment, but also as a sign intended by Providence to distinguish the sexes, which we ought not to reject. A young man, who came to the school, foppishly dressed, with his hair nicely curled, was treated to a long lecture on the subject. The possibility that he might take offence and not come again nor follow his advice, did not deter the philosopher from performing a duty, for the neglect of which he might afterwards have been justly reproached by the pupil. Epictetus objected to dirtiness and slovenliness even more than to too much finery. He would have them always neat, that their company might be agreeable to their fellow-pupils, and he did not disdain to enter into the details of the care of the body—that they ought to blow their nose, wash their feet, wipe off perspiration, and clean their teeth : ' why ? that you may be a human being, not an animal, not a pig ! ' This solicitude for the bodily and mental welfare which ranged from the most important to the most trifling details and even interfered with a man's private life, was extended to the members of the pupils' household by philosophers, without its being considered obtrusive on their part.

For example : Favorinus was informed that the wife of one of his hearers, a man of distinguished family and of senatorial rank, had just been delivered of a son ; he immediately repaired with all the pupils present to the house of the young father, congratulated him and then expressed the hope that the wife would rear the child herself. When the mother objected to this, Favorinus immediately delivered a long speech on the subject, which Gellius took down and afterwards incorporated

in his *Noctes Atticae*. Naturally, the advice of philosophers was sought by their pupils in all cases of difficulty and conscientious scruples. When Gellius, who had been appointed a judge at a very early age (not, however, before he was twenty-five), was unable to decide a certain case, he adjourned the court, went straight off to Favorinus, to whom he was greatly attached, and begged him to give him his opinion of the particular case and some general rules on the duties of a judge. To all appearance, philosophers had reason to complain that their advice was asked too often rather than too seldom. As Epictetus says, they were expected to supply rules of conduct in practical affairs, as a shoemaker or blacksmith supplies his wares; while those who desired advice made no effort on their own part to assimilate those moral principles, from which the decision in all individual cases must be derived.

As a rule philosophers (apart from occasional interference in particular cases) exercised a practical activity and thereby a direct effect on the moral education of their contemporaries under three characters: as educators and permanent advisers of individuals, as teachers of morality in public schools; lastly, as missionaries and popular preachers; the last field, which the Cynics had chosen, was almost entirely abandoned to them. All the forms of professional philosophical activity are mentioned often enough by philosophers and non-philosophers, so that it is possible to obtain an idea of them, at least to a certain extent. Certainly, it is chiefly the shady and bad side, the defects and weaknesses, the ill-success and inadequacy of philosophical effort and performance, that are made the subject of discussion, and upon which the numerous opponents of philosophy on principle especially delight to dwell. But even these criticisms and attacks are a proof of the lofty claims put forward on behalf of philosophy as the moral elevator of the contemporary world, and even if such claims were only imperfectly justified in the case of the majority, yet it is admitted, tacitly or expressly, that the best and purest teachers made them good in the highest degree and exercised an enormous effect.

While the great majority were obliged to content themselves, for their moral education, with a brief course of philosophical instruction, people of larger means very frequently sought to secure the entire services of a philosopher in their household,

not only to educate their children, but also to secure for the rest of their life a trustworthy and permanent counsellor, guide and spiritual adviser. Under the monarchy, as in the last days of the republic, it seems to have been especially in the great Roman families that Greek philosophers frequently assumed this position. Such, apparently, was the relation of the Stoic Publius Egnatius Celer to Barea Soranus, whose teacher, client and friend he is called, and whose condemnation (in 66) he brought about by the false testimony which Barea's accusers had bribed him to give. A monument found near Bonn is erected by his wife to the philosopher Quintus Aegrilius Euaretus, 'the friend of Salvius Julianus' (consul in 175 and legate of Upper Germany in 179); from this it appears that Julianus could not do without the society of Euaretus even in his province. But these house-philosophers, like philosophers in general, especially play the part of companions and comforters before death; no doubt the decision whether a man should take his own life was often left to them. Thus Tullius Marcellinus, an acquaintance of Seneca, a young man who had suffered from a wearisome and painful illness, was persuaded by a Stoic to starve himself to death. Tacitus relates of Titus Petronius as something unusual, that, while he delayed death by binding up his arteries, he asked that frivolous poems might be recited to him, but nothing about the immortality of the soul and the doctrines of philosophers. When Julius Canus, condemned to death by Caligula, set out for the hill, where, to use the expression of Seneca, 'victims were daily offered to our Caesar', he was accompanied by 'his philosopher', with whom he conversed about his thoughts at the time, and the condition of his soul. Rubellius Plautus, who awaited the emissaries of Nero without attempting flight, was reported to have been confirmed by the philosophers Musonius Rufus and Coeranus in his resolution to prefer death to a life of anxiety and uncertainty. The messenger who brought the expected death-warrant to Thrasea, found him absorbed in conversation with the Cynic Demetrius: 'from their earnest looks and some words uttered more loudly than the rest, it could be inferred that they were discussing the nature of the soul and the separation of mind and body'. The emperor Julian also, when fatally wounded, entered upon an abstruse discussion of the sublime nature of the human soul

with the philosophers Maximus and Priscus, and carried it on till he expired.

The position which Greek philosophers accepted in great Roman families for a certain length of time, could only be maintained on a level worthy of the dignity of philosophy if both parties regarded it from the highest point of view. In such cases, the philosophers themselves were only too often incapable of securing the esteem of those to whom they should above all have set a good example. On the other hand, distinguished Romans seldom entirely forgot that these ' teachers of wisdom ' were in reality only their dependants or paid employees. The shady side of the picture has been represented at considerable length and in strong language by Lucian in his usual style, in a treatise specially written to warn a certain philosopher named Timocrates, who wanted to obtain a post in an aristocratic family. This shady side was no doubt unpleasantly in evidence with special frequency, after Marcus Aurelius had made philosophy the fashion. Many who were unable either to understand or respect it, thought it their duty to go into raptures over the lofty idealism of Plato, and desired, if possible, to have a Greek philosopher in their train, who might be at once recognized as such by his venerable appearance, his long beard and the dignity with which he wore his cloak. The prospect of obtaining an honourable and influential position in a great and wealthy family was highly attractive to many, who did not shrink from the annoyances incidental to their application for the post. They were even ready to submit to a test of their qualifications, at which they had to give proofs of their knowledge and ability, to undergo an inquiry into their past, and sometimes had to compete with most unworthy candidates, many of whom only used the philosophers' mask as a recommendation for exorcism, magic and similar practices. If this examination was successfully passed, after an invitation to a big dinner, at which the brilliancy of the establishment was calculated to dazzle and intimidate the novice, the question of terms was discussed and settled. The master of the house declared his readiness to share everything with his new house-companion; ' for it would be ridiculous not to treat a man, to whom one has confided one's most precious possession, one's own soul or that of one's children, as joint owner of everything else '. Neverthe-

less, a yearly salary was fixed, which was certainly surprisingly small, but was considered to be made up for by the friendly and honourable treatment promised, by the frequent presents on feast-days; above all, an appeal was made to the lofty ideas of philosophers on the question of money. In this manner philosophers advanced in years, forgetting the praises of liberty sung by Plato, Chrysippus and Aristotle, sold themselves into base and ignominious servitude; like the rest of the crowd of domestics, from whom they were only distinguished by their coarse cloak and their bad Latin, they were summoned by the clock every morning to their duty as supernumeraries, which lasted till a late hour and entailed unpleasantnesses and degradation of all kinds, inflicted only too frequently upon the patient Greeks, who were not expected to complain. When they were used up or their company was no longer required, they were quietly turned out of the house on a foggy night on some utterly unfounded charge, helpless and utterly destitute.

The position of the representatives of philosophy at court was far more precarious than in the great houses, and far less consistent with the ideals of the science; indeed, in the opinion of many a philosopher was as much out of place at court as in a tavern. Plutarch has endeavoured to prove in a special treatise that, in spite of all dangers and difficulties, the wise man cannot in certain circumstances refuse such a position, since he has the opportunity of doing incomparably more good in it than in any other. The philosopher will be all the more ready to undertake the care of a soul, whose activity, wisdom and justice affects the lot of many; for in this manner he will benefit the many through the individual, like Anaxagoras the friend of Pericles, Plato of Dio, Pythagoras of the statesmen of Italy. Philosophers who devote themselves to the moral education of private persons liberate individuals only from their weaknesses and passions; but he who ennobles the character of a ruler thereby promotes the interests of and improves the condition of the whole state. For the sake of such advantages one must submit to become a courtier and to be abused like a servant. If even the philosopher who refrains from all practical activity on principle does not shun the society of educated princes of noble character, one who takes an interest in political life will also take an interest in them, unobtrusively and without annoying them with un-

timely and sophistical advice, while at the same time he will be always ready to meet their request for his advice and assistance.

From the incidental mention of philosophers as resident at the courts of Augustus, Nero, Trajan, Hadrian, Julia Domna and Elagabalus (the 'sham philosophers'), it would seem that, like other learned men, the teachers of philosophy very frequently, if not as a rule, had their place in the imperial *entourage* (as συμβιωταί). These positions also were to some extent salaried. Lucian says that one of the most distinguished philosophers of the time was paid by the emperor for his society, but was compelled, in spite of his age, to accompany him on his travels, like an Indian or Scythian hireling. It naturally depended on the personality of the emperors and the tone of the court, whether the position of the philosopher was worthy or unworthy of him. Seneca reminds Marcia, in his letter of consolation, how Augustus' wife Julia, whose intimate friend she was, after the death of Drusus sought and found consolation in the pious exhortation of Areus, 'her husband's philosopher'; according to Seneca, Areus in addressing Julia calls himself 'the constant companion of your husband, one who knows not only what is public property, but all the more secret impulses of both your minds'. Augustus, after the conquest of Alexandria, had honoured Areus by declaring that he would spare the city, since it was his birthplace. Nero, on the other hand, made his philosophers a source of amusement, by inviting representatives of different schools to dinner and setting them on to wrangle.

But undoubtedly philosophers, especially those who were conscious of their value, for the most part preferred a public sphere of activity to the most brilliant position at court or in a distinguished family. The Stoic Apollonius, when summoned by Antoninus Pius to undertake the tuition of the young Marcus Aurelius, left Chalcis with a number of his pupils and settled in Rome, but refused to take up his quarters in the palace of Tiberius, where Marcus Aurelius lived. He declared that it was the duty of the pupil to go to the teacher, which the heir to the throne actually did. The opening of a public school not only held out the prospect of a worthier life, of an important and, in certain conditions, even splendid activity, which might extend in centres like Athens and Rome to the

pick of the young men from various provinces, but also of a magnificent income. For to all appearance only the minority held such strict views as the Platonist Nigrinus, who called the schools of the philosophers who taught for money stalls and shops where virtue was offered for sale like any other wares.

But, apart from this, the conduct of philosophers who taught in public, and especially their lectures and method of instruction, gave cause for various criticisms. And this censure is expressed so freely and emphatically and so constantly repeated by the philosophical writers of the time, that we might easily be inclined to form too unfavourable an opinion of the philosophers' schools at that time. But it must never be forgotten that men like Musonius, Plutarch, Epictetus, Taurus and Demonax were, as a matter of fact, bound to insist upon the same high standard of excellence in others, up to which they themselves acted, and that they had incessantly to remind teachers and pupils how far they were still removed from the true aim of philosophy, in order to bring them nearer to it. Thus in their writings they constantly refer to the weaknesses, trivialities and defects which hampered philosophical instruction and could only be acutely felt when contrasted with the numerous examples of noble and splendid work and effort which the age could show.

The effects of philosophical instruction were in any case without doubt only too often hindered through the fault of teachers and pupils alike. Vanity, thirst for fame, and probably greed of gain often led teachers to think more of the applause than of the real welfare of their hearers, many of whom preferred agreeable conversation, the exercise of acuteness, and the acquisition of a knowledge adapted for show, to serious study and a difficult and painful struggle for moral ennoblement. Hence many who had attended philosophical lectures for years with unwearying industry did not even carry away from them a smattering of philosophical culture. Many, says Seneca, came only to hear, not to learn, just for recreation, as one goes to the theatre ; for a great part of the pupils the school is a place of amusement. Their object is not to throw off vice and adopt a new rule of life, but to find something to tickle their ears. Others came with writing tablets, to get hold of the words, not their meaning ; words

which they repeat to others with as little profit as they listen to them themselves. Lofty passages in the lectures make an impression upon some, which is reflected in their faces, but, like the nervous excitement produced by music, is not permanent; only a few are capable of retaining the substance of what they have taken down. Consequently, the majority of pupils were not in the frame of mind which Musonius regarded as indispensable, if instruction was to prove successful. A hearer who is not quite lost, he said, ought to shiver while the philosopher is speaking; to feel ashamed, repentant, joyful and astonished by turns; the expression of his features should change according as the philosopher's treatment of the diseased or healthy parts of his soul variously affects him and his conscience. In fact Epictetus, who had heard Musonius, attests that his language was so forcible, that he gave such prominence to moral infirmities, that every one of his hearers, applying his words to himself, believed that some one had been speaking against him to the philosopher. But it was just this (as Plutarch also complains) that was too much for the majority of those who listened to a philosopher's lecture as if he had been a tragedian or orator. As long as he kept to generalities, they willingly followed him, but as soon as he began to deliver frank and emphatic warnings, they took it ill as a piece of officiousness; and many were weak-minded enough to stay away from the school after a speech that touched them on the raw, like patients who, after the surgeon has used the knife, run away without waiting for the bandages. Beginners also allowed themselves to be frightened by the difficulties of the study or the lecture, or were too shy to ask for explanations, or pretended that everything was clear to them even when they understood nothing. Many even had the assurance to attempt to teach the teacher how he ought to teach. 'One', says the Platonist Taurus, 'comes and says, "Teach me this first," another, "I want to learn this, not that"; one wants to begin with the *Symposium* of Plato because it speaks of the nocturnal revels of Alcibiades; another with the *Phædrus* for the sake of the speech of Lysias. There are really some who want to read Plato, not to ennoble their life but to refine their manner of expressing themselves, not to become more moral but to become more agreeable members of society'. The complaint of Taurus that many

teachers, even without being invited, hastened to the doors of wealthy young men where they patiently waited till midday, till their pupils had slept off their last night's debauch, is a proof that there were teachers who were ready to accommodate themselves to the most unjustifiable requests of their pupils. Epictetus recommends his pupils, when they hear any one speaking in a manner which shows that he has not the vaguest idea of the first principles of morality, to ask themselves seriously : Am I a man of this sort ? ' Am I conscious that I know nothing, as a man should be who really knows nothing ? Do I approach the teacher as if he were an oracle, prepared to render implicit obedience ? Or do I enter the school, like a drivelling idiot, only in order to learn the external accessories of philosophy, and to understand books which I did not understand before, and to be able to explain them to others, as occasion serves ? ' The pupils, he continues, certainly wear the garb of the philosopher, but their soul is not at peace and free from the anxieties and excitements of the external world. Perhaps one of them has had a fight at home with a slave, which caused an uproar amongst his neighbours ; or a foreign student is greatly annoyed because he has not received a remittance from home, or is thinking of what people say of him there, that he is certainly making progress and will return omniscient. ' I should certainly like that ', he says to himself ; ' but one has to work so hard, and nobody sends me anything from home ; the baths at Nicopolis are wretched, it is as miserable here as at home '. ' And then they say : nobody gets any good from the school. But who attends it in order to be cured of his errors and to purge his opinions, to discover what he needs ? What you go to school to look for, that you will carry away with you. You want to chatter about principles. Do not they provide you with ample material for boasting of your pretended knowledge ? Do you not reduce syllogisms, do you not understand how to manage sophisms and fallacies ? '

But it was not the fault of the pupils alone that philosophical instruction did not produce the desired result. Often enough the responsibility lay with the teachers, eager for applause, fame and money, who, knowing that people were mostly influenced by externalities, and above all by a brilliant style, neglected matter for form. The orator's grey hairs, says

Plutarch, the modulation of his voice, his gravity and self-conscious assurance, but, above all, the sound of applause, carry away young and inexperienced hearers; the expression also has something deceptive about it, if it is graceful and copious, weighty and well-prepared for the occasion. Pliny's eulogy of the highly respected Stoic Euphrates shows how essential were the personal appearance and oratorical skill of the philosopher even in the judgment of educated hearers. 'He disputes with subtlety, solidity and elegance; often he goes so far as to reproduce the well-known sublimity and copiousness of Plato. His language is rich and varied, and particularly agreeable, so as to lead on and impel those even who fight against it. Add to this that he is tall of stature, of noble countenance, with flowing locks and a huge white beard; all of which may be thought mere accidents of no account, yet they add greatly to the veneration which he inspires. There is no squalor in his attire, nothing of moroseness about him, but much grave earnestness: his approach is productive of respect, not awe. His sanctity of life is remarkable, and no less so is his affability. He inveighs against vices, not individuals; sinners he reclaims rather than chides. You follow his admonitions attentively, hanging on his lips, and longing to be convinced even after he has succeeded in convincing you' (*Epistles*, i. 10, J. D. Lewis's translation). Naturally, rhetoricians as a rule only paid attention to form. One of them expresses himself as follows in Epictetus: 'Let us call on Epictetus as we pass and hear what he has to say before we charter a ship'; then, when leaving the philosopher's house, 'There was nothing in Epictetus; he makes blunders in construction and etymology'. Your only reason for coming to school is to criticize mistakes of that kind, is the philosopher's rejoinder.

Epictetus, who by no means denied the effect of eloquence in a philosophical discourse, would scarcely have made pompous, flowery language and eagerness for applause the subject of a lengthy dissertation, if they had not been common faults of the 'professional philosophers' of the age. The little scenes from life with which his exhortations are interlarded afford admirable illustrations of the self-complacent vanity of this class of teachers and of their general behaviour. Wherever they showed themselves, their desire was to hear people

shout, 'Oh the great philosopher!' and they walked along as if they had swallowed a spear.[1] If his audience was scanty and their applause small, the professor went away downcast; if the applause was great, he went round and asked each one, What did you think of me?—Admirable, sir, as I hope to be saved![2]—How did I deliver that passage?—Which passage?—The one in which I described Pan and the Nymphs.—Marvellously.—Why then, continues Epictetus in his attack on these philosophical rhetoricians, did you praise that senator?—Because he is a talented and industrious young man.—How so?—He admires me.—That's proof enough!—But, he continues, after having been your pupil so long, after having heard your disputations and lectures, has he become more modest? does he examine himself? does he know how parlous is his condition? has he thrown off his conceit? does he desire instruction? You say yes; well then, does he desire to be taught how to live? no, you fool, but how to talk; it is for this that he admires you; listen to what he says, 'this man really writes most artistically, far more elegantly than Dio!'[3] So then do you, whose state of mind is so deplorable, you who are so greedy of applause and count the number of your audience, do you pretend to teach others?—Well, I had a very large audience to-day.—Yes, very numerous; there may have been five hundred altogether.—That's not nearly enough, more likely a thousand; Dio never had so many to listen to him.—How should he?—And they show a fine appreciation of lectures. What is beautiful, sir, can move even a stone.—There you have the words of a philosopher, there you have the state of mind of one who thinks to benefit mankind, there you have a man who has heard a lecture! Did Socrates ever say, when in the company of his pupils, Come and listen to the discourse which I am going to deliver in the house of Quadratus? Why should I listen to you? do you want to show me how admirably you can arrange words? Granted: but what good is it to you?—Well, you ought to applaud me.—How?—Say, Oh! and, Excellent!—So then it is for this that young men are to quit their country, leave parents, friends, kinsmen and all that belongs to

[1] We should say, 'a poker'. The Greek word (ὀβελίσκος) also means 'a spit'.
[2] 'I swear by all that is dear to me' (Long's trans.).
[3] Dio Chrysostom of Prusa in Bithynia, not Dio Cassius the historian.

them, that they may applaud your fine concluding periods ? Did Socrates, Zeno and Cleanthes do this ? But it may be objected, says Epictetus ; is there not a special style for hortatory speeches ? Certainly, just as there is a style for refutation and a didactic style. But who has ever mentioned a fourth in addition to these, the epideictic (display) style ? In what does the hortatory style really consist ? In the ability to make clear to one person or several the nature of the struggle in which they are involved, and to convince them that they think of everything else but what they really desire. They really desire what leads to happiness, but seek it in the wrong direction. To attain this, is it necessary to provide thousands of seats and invite thousands of hearers, to mount the platform in elegant attire or in a shabby philosopher's cloak and describe the death of Achilles ? I implore you by the gods to give up spoiling noble words and subjects. Who that has heard your lectures and disputations has ever felt anxiety for his own salvation or communed with himself ? Who of them has ever said on leaving : The philosopher touched me to the quick ! I must not do these things any more ! Does he not rather say to some one else, even if you have been loudly applauded, What he said about Xerxes was very fine ? to which another rejoins, No ; but about the battle of Thermopylae. And this, forsooth, is what one hears from a philosopher !

The philosophers resembled the sophists in their style of lecturing, their hearers also applauded as if expressing their approval of a brilliantly executed piece of music rather than of the serious exhortations of a professor of morality. When the philosopher, says Musonius, exhorts, warns, advises, reprimands or instructs in any other way, and his hearers indulge in unconsidered and hackneyed words of praise, shout and gesticulate, are roused and excited by elegances of expression, by the rhythmical cadence of words, then you may feel sure that both speaker and hearers are alike worthless, that it is not a philosopher who is speaking, but some one playing the flute. Similarly Plutarch says that the noisy applause in the philosophers' schools would lead any one outside to believe that a dancer or musical virtuoso was being encored. He also criticizes the expressions of approval, which were then in fashion. As if the old-fashioned exclamations,

Good ! Wise ! True ! were no longer sufficient, people now cried, Divine ! Inspired ! Inimitable ! and confirmed their words by an oath. Agreement with a philosopher was expressed by Clever ! with an old man by Witty ! or Brilliant ! But certainly, in Plutarch's opinion, the hearer ought not, on the other hand, to sit mum and listless, as if he thought that he had only, as it were, to take his seat at dinner, while others worked their hardest. But even at lectures at which applause was not the rule, the audience generally sat upright in their places, not in a careless or supercilious attitude, kept their eyes on the speaker, showed a lively interest and wore a cheerful, kindly expression, not only free from ill-humour, but from all distracting thoughts that had nothing to do with the lecture. Not only a gloomy brow, wandering looks, a stooping attitude, legs crossed in an unseemly manner, but also nodding and whispering to a neighbour, smiling, yawning, an air of depression and the like—all these were to be sedulously avoided.

The almost minute precision of the rules by which men of such great and recognized importance as Plutarch, Epictetus and others thought it their duty to assist in maintaining the dignity of philosophical instruction is in itself by no means the least convincing proof how deep and widespread must have been the interest taken in philosophical lectures and schools. And, similarly, the claims put forward by the most important writers as to the efficiency of these schools, show that, notwithstanding all the weaknesses, aberrations and ill-success of many teachers, they were still regarded as the real centres of moral education, and to some extent justly, as is attested by the works of the numerous philosophical writers of the age.

While the directors of public schools confined their activity to a limited (although extensive) circle of pupils and followers, there was another class of philosophers, who, representing themselves as the real missionaries of morality, devoted their attention to all mankind. These were the Cynics. Even if the majority of these ' mendicant friars of antiquity ', as above described, deserved their bad name, yet the truly noble personalities in their ranks, who for the sake of their lofty mission renounced all worldly goods, were the objects of an equally general admiration and respect. Dio and Epictetus, the most esteemed teachers of the second century, were

inclined to Cynicism, and ranked Diogenes next to Socrates. Epictetus in particular has the highest idea of the mission of the true Cynics: that no one should adopt it unless he is conscious of being chosen for it by the divine will. The Cynic must free himself from all passions and desires. Other men can hide themselves behind the walls of their houses; the only protection of the Cynic, who has no home and lives under the open sky, is modesty; he must have nothing to conceal, for where and how could he conceal it? He, 'the general teacher and instructor', should have nothing to fear; otherwise, how could he 'uphold the dignity of the office of superintendent of the rest of mankind?'

But it is not sufficient that he should acquire knowledge and freedom for himself; he must also know that he has been sent by Zeus as a messenger to men, to instruct them on good and evil, to warn them that they have gone astray and are seeking the substance of good and evil where it is not; but where it is they never think. Then he makes his Cynic preach to the people. 'O ye men, whither are ye being hurried? What are ye doing, O unhappy wretches? Ye seek happiness where it is not. Why do ye seek it outside yourselves? It is not in the body, in riches, in power, or in sovereignty. Consider the strong, the wealthy, the powerful, listen to their sighs and lamentations, look on Nero and Sardanapalus, or Agamemnon!' Having with dramatic vividness set all this before his hearers, especially the constant anxiety and distress of the latter, he makes them ask in the manner of a sermon: 'Where then is the good, if not in all this? Tell us, sir, our messenger and guardian!' 'Where you neither think it is nor seek it. Had you so desired, you would already have discovered it in yourselves, and would not be seeking what is another's as if it were your own. Seek it in yourselves, O unhappy wretches! There you must cultivate it, there cherish and preserve it. How is it possible to live happily, without goods and chattels, without house and home, destitute, uncared for, without a servant, without a country? Look you, God has sent you the man who can show you in practice that it is possible! Look at me: I sleep on the ground, I have no wife, no children, no estate, nothing but earth and sky and a single coarse cloak. And yet what do I lack? Am I not without anxiety and fear? am I not free? How do

I treat those whom you admire and honour? is it not like slaves? do not all, when they see me, think they see their own lord and king?' Epictetus then reiterates that the Cynic must serve the deity with his whole heart and without hindrance and assist his fellow-men; that he must not be tied down by private obligations or other engagements, the violation of which would mean the transgression of the moral law, the observation of them the abandonment of the mission of 'messenger, guardian and herald of the gods'; a special instance of such engagements is marriage. Where in this case would that king be who devotes himself to the general welfare, 'to whose protection the people are entrusted, and upon whom so many cares devolve'; whose duty it is to superintend others, husbands and fathers—to see who treats his wife ill or well, who deserves punishment, whose house is well ordered, whose the reverse; just like a physician who goes round and feels the pulses of his patients? You have fever, you a headache, you the gout; you must fast, you must take food, you must not have a bath, you require the knife, you must be cauterized. How can a man have leisure for all this if he is hampered by private duties? If we truly understand the greatness of the true Cynic, we shall not wonder why he takes no wife, why he begets no children. He is the father of all mankind, all men are his sons, all women his daughters; he cares for them, chides them as a father, as a brother, as a servant of our common father Zeus.

In fact, at that time there were men in Rome who at least approximately realized this ideal. Two of them are known to us, Demetrius, who lived at Rome in the first century, and Demonax, who lived at Athens in the second. The former literally carried out in practice the principles of self-sufficiency and a return to a state of nature amidst the splendour, luxury and excessive culture of golden Rome, the metropolis of the world, and obtained for Cynicism, which Cicero had uncompromisingly rejected as 'the enemy of modesty', the respect of the Romans. The ragged beggar, who rejected with scorn a gift of 200,000 sesterces (about £2,000) from Caligula, who despised Nero's threats, called forth Vespasian's displeasure by his ostentatious disdain, and expressed his contempt for those who disagreed with him with unceremonious bluntness, was greatly in request amongst his most distin-

guished and most highly placed contemporaries, by whom he was treated with the greatest respect. Thrasea devoted his last hours to a conversation with him on the subject of immortality and the next world. Seneca's respect for his inflexible strength of mind was the more sincere, since he was conscious of his own weakness in comparison; in his judgment, Demetrius was a great man even when compared with the greatest. Seneca abandoned the society of those who were clothed in purple, in order to be able constantly to enjoy the conversation of this noble man, whom he so greatly admired. And how could he help admiring him? In fact he lacked nothing; he lived not as if he despised everything, but as if he had left it for others. Upon those who heard him speaking as he lay naked on his straw pallet he produced the double impression that he was not only a teacher, but a witness of truth. According to Seneca, 'Nature has created him in our time in order to show that neither can he be corrupted by us nor we improved by him. He is a man of perfect wisdom, although he himself disclaims it, and of unshakable resolution in carrying out his principles, while his eloquence is equal to the loftiest themes; it is neither skilfully arranged nor troubled about words, but pursues its subject with powerful flight, as inspiration urges it. I have no doubt that Providence has endowed him with such lofty morality and power of language that our age might not be without an example and a living reproach'.

A treatise generally attributed to Lucian, and in any case the work of a contemporary, gives a description of a man who was 'an example and a living reproach' to his age, as it were a personification of the ever warning conscience of his fellow-citizens. This was Demonax, who spent the best part of his life in Athens and starved himself to death when nearly a hundred years of age. Demonax was opposed to Demetrius and those like him, but in agreement with Epictetus, with whom he was on friendly terms. He endeavoured to smooth the roughnesses of the Cynic mode of thought, and especially to rob his admonitions and reproofs of their forbidding harshness by the aid of wit and intellectual grace; his entire philosophy was characterized by mildness, kindliness, and cheerfulness. He regarded all men as his kinsmen. He rendered practical assistance to his friends, so far as it was permissible;

warned the fortunate of the transitory nature of the blessings of fortune, and consoled those who complained of poverty, banishment, old age or sickness. He strove to reconcile brothers who had quarrelled, to make peace between husbands and wives, and frequently acted as mediator in political dissensions, and generally with success. In this manner he lived a healthy and peaceful life of nearly a hundred years; he was never a burden to any man, never accused any man; he helped his friends and never had an enemy; and was generally beloved and respected throughout Greece. Whenever he appeared, every one stood up, even the highest officials, and all were silent. Towards the end of his long life, he used to enter the first house he came to without invitation and eat and sleep there; the inmates regarded it as the visit of a god or good spirit. There was a keen rivalry amongst the women who sold bread to be the first to serve him; every one from whom he received a loaf believed that he would bring her luck; the children offered him fruits and called him father. When a party quarrel had broken out in Athens, his mere appearance in the assembly was enough to restore quiet; when he had convinced himself of this, he went away without saying a word. The Athenians gave him a magnificent funeral at the expense of the city, and mourned him for a long time; the stone seat on which he used to rest was held sacred and crowned with garlands in his honour. His funeral was largely attended; all the philosophers were present and carried his body to the grave.

The portrait of Peregrinus, later called Proteus, is not so clear, since we only know him from the description of Lucian, in which he appears as much a fool as a knave. But it is clear that this description cannot possibly correspond to the reality, not only from the unimpeachable testimony of another contemporary, but partly from Lucian's own statements. We can hardly be mistaken in regarding the sordid or shameful motives which Lucian attributes to Peregrinus in all that he did, as the malicious assumptions and fabrications of passionate opponents, who were absolutely incapable of understanding the nature of a fanatic such as Peregrinus.

Peregrinus was the son of a well-to-do citizen of Parium on the Hellespont. In the course of his travels, extending over several years, he visited Palestine, where he joined the

Christians and so zealously advocated their doctrines in his writings, that he was appointed president of the community. Thrown into prison in consequence of his conversion, he is said to have begged to be put to death, but the governor of Syria, not considering him of sufficient importance to deserve martyrdom, discharged him. Returning to Parium, he presented to it what was left of his property, which had been plundered during his absence and was supposed by his followers to be very large (according to Lucian it amounted to the considerable sum of fifteen talents, £3,536 9s.), and then recommenced his wandering life. Having quarrelled with the Christians, he adopted Cynicism in Egypt, and crossed over to Rome, where he criticized the existing order so outspokenly that he was expelled by the city praefect. He is then said foolishly to have attempted to stir up a revolt against the Romans in Greece. In 165 he put an end to his life at Olympia, after the games were over, by carrying out his long-announced intention of burning himself to death ; on a bright moonlight night, in the presence of a crowd of Cynics, calling upon the spirits of his parents, he threw himself upon a funeral pyre erected in a ditch and disappeared in the grave of fire.

The conversion of Peregrinus to Christianity, his defection and adoption of Cynicism, are quite intelligible. ' It was just a nature like his that, in the restless search for truth and internal satisfaction, could be as easily attracted to Christianity as it was subsequently estranged from it, when subordination to ecclesiastical dogma and ecclesiastical customs was required of it '. But Christianity and Cynicism were not only in perfect agreement in the absolute contrast which both presented with polytheism, but the Cynic abandonment of all earthly ties and contempt for the world was closely akin to that element of Christianity, which subsequently found complete expression in the life of the hermit and the monk. Nor did this affinity pass unnoticed in ancient times. Celsus had compared the preachers of the doctrines of Christianity with mountebanks, since they addressed themselves by preference to the uneducated masses, to which Origen replies that the Cynic popular preachers did exactly the same. Julian the Apostate found a great similarity between ' those who renounced the world, as the impious Galilaeans called them'. and the Cynics ; the difference was that the latter did not

make such a good thing out of it as the former, who 'by renouncing a little scraped together a great deal, or rather everything', since the duty of charity supplied them with a decent excuse for raising tribute. The Cynics had no such excuse, and besides even the heathen were more intelligent than 'those fools'. In everything else there was no difference between the two. Both accepted honour and homage for their pretended renunciation; both abandoned their country, wandered all over the world. and made themselves a nuisance in camp, the Cynics being even more impertinent and obtrusive than the monks. In view of these and similar comparisons between Cynicism and Christianity, John Chrysostom and Gregory of Nazianzus thought it necessary to point out emphatically how far inferior the former was to the latter.

That the gloomy, harsh and rugged aspect of Cynicism was especially prominent in Peregrinus is shown by the rejoinder of Demonax (whose cheerfulness made Peregrinus refuse to acknowledge him as a Cynic), 'And you are no man!' Gellius, however, who often visited him in his hut near Athens not long before his end, speaks of him with great respect. He had heard many excellent and salutary words from this 'worthy and strong-minded man', who, amongst other things, asserted that the wise man would do nothing wrong, even though gods and men should not know that he had done wrong. For one ought to avoid sin, not from fear of punishment or disgrace, but from love of the good. But in the case of those who lack this higher moral strength, the thought that no wrong can remain hidden, but that time will finally bring all things to light, is a very effectual motive for avoiding ill-doing.

Lastly, his self-destruction was intended to crown a life in which he had striven to imitate Heracles, the great model of the Cynics, with an end like that of the hero; to teach men contempt of death and at the same time to prove to the world that a Cynic also was capable of the much admired resolution of the Indian sage Calanus. The postponement of his suicide till the Olympian games were over, the choice of night time for carrying it out, the admission of only a few spectators of similar opinions, do not prove that Peregrinus sought his greatest triumph in theatrical effect. Certainly he was a fanatic, but there is no reason to doubt the earnestness and sincerity of his convictions, and, with the exception

of Lucian's account, there is no evidence that, at that time or later, they were ever doubted. About twelve years after his death Athenagoras saw his statue in Parium, and Ammianus Marcellinus, in mentioning his suicide (also referred to by the chroniclers) calls him a famous philosopher.

The Cynic school continued to exist till the end of antiquity. In addition to the discourses of Julian, there is no lack of evidence which permits us to trace its continuance, and as late as the beginning of the fifth century its adherents were evidently very numerous.

It is only natural that the literature of the time should tell us far more of the attempts to elevate the standard of morality through philosophy than of its effects. Nevertheless, all that we are told goes to show that as a matter of fact philosophy was then regarded by the educated world as the true and highest moral educator of humanity, and even the opposition to it only confirms the universality of this conviction. That the zealous and comprehensive efforts hitherto described really produced important results, is clear from the simple fact that so large a number of the noblest men of these centuries, on their own information or according to the statement of others, were indebted to philosophy for the formation of their character; and further, from the high respect which was paid to distinguished philosophers by their contemporaries and posterity. In a world which refused slaves the rights of men, the former slave Epictetus was one of the most generally respected personalities, and Hadrian, the ruler of this world, is said to have sought his friendship. The most important teachers and writers of these centuries, the freedman Epictetus, the knight Musonius Rufus, Seneca the consular and the emperor Marcus Aurelius, belonged to the most different classes and ranks of life. The effect of philosophy extended to all strata of society, from the highest to the lowest. Philosophy, says Seneca, does not look at a man's pedigree; the equestrian order, the senate, and military service are closed to many; but knowledge is open to all, and all are of noble birth as far as its attainment is concerned. A great soul can reside in the body of a slave or freedman as well as in that of a Roman knight.

But not only did philosophy break through the barriers and limitations of the orders and classes of society; it

also to a great extent weakened the exclusiveness of national consciousness, and by its partial subjection of this feeling, so strongly developed in all ancient peoples (and especially in the Romans) and so harshly asserted, it proved itself to be one of the most real and transforming influences of the period of civilization which is here described. Cynicism and Stoicism, in particular, developed their original leaning towards cosmopolitanism and a brotherly love that included all mankind, on the highly favourable soil of the Roman world-empire, in such a manner that their theories of the relation of the individual to mankind breathe a Christian spirit to the same extent as they attest a most decided rupture with the specifically ancient views of the world. It was thought by many that this development of philosophy could only be explained by direct Christian influences; but in the case of Seneca no such explanation of this phenomenon was needed, and the repugnance to 'the Galilaeans' expressed by Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius excludes the assumption of Christian influences. The Christians of that period, indeed (as already observed), themselves recognized an independent morality of the heathen, which they attempted to account for partly by their acquaintance with the sacred writings of the Jews, partly by the intervention of 'demons' working against Christianity. They would certainly not have had recourse to such singular explanations had they believed that the virtues of the heathen could be attributed to Christian influences. In fact, the result of an unprejudiced investigation must be that Stoicism and Cynicism raised themselves by their own efforts to a moral conception of men's rights and duties higher and purer than any in earlier antiquity. The Stoic principle of the homogeneousness of all men, who, as Epictetus expresses it, all have God for their father, and consequently are all brothers, was first followed out by the Stoics of this age in its widest extent and to its ultimate results. They taught, expressly and repeatedly, love of one's enemy, patience and indulgence not only towards the erring, but forgiveness of evil done to us and its requital with benefits. A comparison of the views of that age with those of the older philosophers in regard to slavery affords the most infallible criterion of the progress made in the idea of the relation of the individual to humanity. Plato found nothing offensive

in this ' cancerous affection of the ancient world ', and never conceived the idea of a complete abolition of slavery in the future ; while Aristotle even endeavoured to prove that it is a natural institution, and regarded slaves as ' living chattels ' and barbarians as born slaves of the Hellenes. Seneca, on the other hand, insists that we should regard slaves above all as human beings, as humble friends, and, in so far as they are subject to the same authority as ourselves, as fellow-slaves. And there is no doubt that these theories did in reality contribute essentially to the improvement of the position of slaves. The effects of the philosophy of that age lasted far beyond its own days ; the third century affords us the remarkable evidence of Origen, which is beyond suspicion, that while few still read Plato, Epictetus was read ' by all '.

An age which raised itself by its own efforts to higher and purer views of morality than all the ages which preceded it, which not only produced a Musonius, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius, but in which these preachers of a gentle, truly human system of ethics were generally admired and their doctrines generally adopted, cannot have been an age of utter moral decay, as it has been so often called. If there is no graduated scale of the morality of a period so well known, least of all is there one for these centuries, in regard to which we possess only isolated statements, partly limited to definite spheres, partly exaggerated or one-sided. To the latter belong the rhetorical declamations of the elder Pliny and Seneca ; to the former the description of the horrors of the imperial house, the awful consequences of an absolute despotism, the fearful suppression of the aristocracy by Caesarism, in Tacitus and the other historians, and the accounts of the corruption, filth, and immorality which Rome, like every great city, fostered in abundance, in the satirists and in Martial. It would be inadmissible to draw general conclusions from these sources alone as to the morality of the whole period, even if they did not offer, amidst much that is repulsive,hateful and horrifying, many agreeable and sublime impressions, which even decidedly predominate in other authorities, such as the letters of the younger Pliny, and the works of Quintilian, Plutarch and Gellius. And if we leave out of consideration those declamations about the disappearance of the ' good old times ', it will be difficult to find any evidence in the literature of the

age that men thought they were living in a period of general decay, but rather the reverse. Even Seneca concludes a striking picture of the prevailing immorality with the declaration that he does not wish to fasten the responsibility upon his own age. 'Our forefathers complained, we complain, and our descendants will complain, that morals are corrupt, that wickedness holds sway, that men are sinking deeper and deeper in sinfulness, that the condition of mankind is going from bad to worse. But in reality they remain where they were, and will still remain so, save for trifling movements in one direction or the other, like waves carried backwards and forwards by the ebb and flow. . . . Vices belong to no particular age, but to all mankind. No age has been free from guilt'. Tacitus was convinced that everything was not better in earlier times, but that his age also had produced much that was worthy of imitation by posterity; perhaps there is a cycle of morality, as of events. And Marcus Aurelius, whose view of the world was principally determined by the Stoic doctrine of the eternal cycle of events, who saw in history only an eternal repetition, was bound to regard human wickedness as something that ever remained the same. 'What is wickedness?' he asks. 'That which you have often seen. Ancient, medieval and modern history will be found full of the same things as houses and cities at the present time. Nothing is new'. But he was far from seeing nothing but wickedness in the present. Nothing delighted him more than to think of the good qualities of his contemporaries, and his greatest pleasure was to survey as a whole the examples of the virtues exhibited in the character of each.

CHAPTER IV

BELIEF IN THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL

WHEREVER and whenever the belief in immortality has not been firmly established by belief in revelation, doubt, unbelief and denial of immortality have been associated with the different forms which such belief has assumed. It is probable that not only have there always been men to whom the eternal existence of an individual appeared unintelligible, but also others for whom life was only endurable as ending with death, and who were filled with horror at the idea of its lasting for ever. It is remarkable that it is one of the most energetic natures of the later Roman world, the elder Pliny, who rejects, almost passionately, the belief in immortality. He was a man whose lot was a favoured one, who with untiring perseverance strove to make every minute of his life serviceable to the state, to humanity, to the knowledge of truth, and in the pursuit of this object found a noble end that was worthy of his life.

'Every man's last hour brings about exactly the same state of things that existed before his first hour. Souls and bodies no more have feelings and consciousness after death than they had before birth. But human vanity imagines a prolongation of existence into the future, and invents a life beyond the grave, attributing sometimes immortality, sometimes change of form to the soul, and sometimes consciousness to those below the earth; it worships departed spirits and makes those gods, who have ceased to be even men; as if our breath in any way differed from that of all other creatures, or as if other things in nature did not last much longer than man, for which no one has foretold immortality. But what sort of body could the soul have after its emancipation? What substance? what power of thought? How could

it see, hear, and taste? What use could it make of these gifts, or what good would it be without them? Where is its place of abode, and how great is the number of shadowy souls after so many centuries? All such ideas are only fit to pacify children, idle dreams of a state of mortality, which is anxious to last for ever! What absurd folly, to think that life can be renewed by death! And where would there ever be rest for the created, if the consciousness of the soul continued in heaven, and the shades of the dead in the underworld? In reality this pretended sweet consolation and this happy faith robs death, the chief blessing of nature, of its virtue, and doubles the pain of a dying man by holding out the prospect of a life beyond. For if it is sweet to live, to whom can it be sweet to have lived? But how much easier and more certain would it be for every one to trust in himself and accept his experience of the time before birth as a certain proof of what will happen in the future!'

This expression of a longing for annihilation, which bears some resemblance to the Buddhist view of life, stands by itself. But the materialistic conception of the soul and the denial of immortality based upon it were at least as common as the Epicureanism, by which Pliny's view was no doubt directly or indirectly determined, and with which his materialism also agrees in the idea of a heavenly origin of the soul and its 'kinship with the stars'. For the convinced adherents of this doctrine the prospect of an end of existence was not a melancholy one. It was for them a consoling thought, to reach a harbour, where they would be for ever removed from disappointments and the caprices of destiny. Their fancy was taken by the idea of rising calmly from the table of life, like guests who had had their fill, in order to abandon themselves to a dreamless sleep. The memorial of Gaius Matrinius Valentius is dedicated by his wife, who survived him, 'to eternal sleep'. Other funeral monuments of similar character, and others dedicated 'to eternal rest' (*securitati*), indicate the denial of immortality, although not always expressed so unequivocally as in the self-composed epitaph of a certain Nicomedes of Cos, who was apparently a strolling singer of the Homeric poems: 'After having ridiculed absurdities, I lie here in a sleep from which there is no awaking'. A Latin inscription runs: 'I have lived and believed in

nothing beyond the grave'; a Greek one: 'There is no boat in Hades, no Charon, no Aeacus who holds the keys, no Cerberus. All of us whom death has carried away are rotten bones and ashes, nothing else'; in another it is said of the dead man that, after having finished his course, he has become a tomb, a stone, an image. 'The elements out of which he was formed take possession of their own again; life was only lent to the man, in death he restores it, he cannot keep it for ever. By his death he pays his debt to nature'. A favourite distich runs: 'I was not, but I became; I was and am no longer; thus much is true. Whoever says otherwise, lies; for I shall no longer be'. It is frequently added that death is no evil, since consciousness ceases with life. A certain Lucius Maecius Marcus, who in his lifetime built an 'eternal house' for himself and his, says in the inscription (as if he were still alive): 'I once was not and now am; one day I shall no longer be; I do not regret it'. On a gravestone the following words are put into the mouth of a dead woman: 'I once was not and am no longer. I know nothing of it; it does not matter to me'. 'Death', it is said on another stone, 'is the last and most beneficial remedy'. This was also expressed jestingly. A freedman named Ancarenus Nothus says in his epitaph that he is no longer afraid of having to go hungry; that he is free from gout and need not pay for his lodging, since he is living in permanent free quarters. With the denial of its continuance is also combined the invitation to enjoy this transitory life: 'I was nothing, I am nothing. Do you who are still alive, eat, drink, enjoy yourselves, come'! 'Do you, O comrade, who read this, enjoy your life; for after death there is neither pain nor laughter, nor joy of any kind'. A sepulchral monument, which was found in 1626 under the confessional of St. Peter's church, a recumbent statue of a man with a drinking-cup in his hand, excited such disgust by the atrocious nature of the inscription, that the statue was hidden or thrown into the Tiber. The inscription was erased with lime, but a copy has been preserved. The deceased, notwithstanding his gross materialism, appears to have led an orderly, decent life as a citizen. He came from Tibur; his name was Flavius Agricola, and he had had himself represented in the attitude in which he was fond of emptying the bottle during his

lifetime. He had lived most agreeably with his wife Flavia Primitiva for thirty years ; she, a modest, industrious, beautiful woman, had been a worshipper of Isis. After her death his son Aurelius Primitivus had consoled him by his affection and received him into his house. In conclusion, he advises his readers in some verses, (which evidently were frequently employed, but in varied form), to enjoy the pleasures of wine and love, since after death everything else is destroyed by earth and fire.

It is highly probable that the most outspoken materialism was the most convincing to unbelievers in the educational sphere to which the composers of these epitaphs belonged, who naturally also were fond of displaying their enlightened ideas and superiority to those who were less advanced by a vigorously worded profession of faith, which neither custom nor dogma prohibited them from recording upon tombstones. On the contrary, this appeared a specially suitable opportunity for summing up their life's experiences ; so that we need not be surprised to find the lowest and most degenerate form of Epicureanism, which sought the only true good in the grossest sensual enjoyment, openly flaunting itself in this manner. Allusion is frequently made to an epitaph in this style on King Sardanapalus, or a variation of it : e.g. What I have eaten and drunk, I have taken with me ; what I have left behind, I have lost. We must interpret in the same sense those epitaphs in which baths, wine, and love, moderately enjoyed, are extolled as the source of true pleasure in life, and the dead man is made to say that he has taken everything with him into the grave, i.e. every real blessing which life can offer has passed into his possession and thereby, as it were, become part of himself.

As compared with the thousands which betray no doubt in a life after death, the number of materialistic epitaphs is exceedingly small, although (as observed) no obstacle existed which could prevent even the most reckless materialist from expressing his unbelief in this manner. The feelings of the ancient world in regard to death and burial were in many respects essentially different from those of the moderns ; to the former even jesting did not seem incompatible with the seriousness of the grave. But we should be bound to assume that materialism had made great strides, even if we

did not possess definite evidence of the spread of Epicureanism, especially amongst the uneducated, and (to judge from modern analogies) perhaps even more amongst the half-educated. Certainly, it is quite impossible to define, at any particular period, the proportion of materialists to believers in immortality; but there is reason to believe that, in spite of their relatively large number, they formed only a small minority even in the later days of antiquity.

If, further, the denial of immortality was a capital and fundamental principle in the materialistic philosophy of Epicurus, the finite nature of the soul was also assumed in other philosophical systems. Certainly, the Stoic belief in a limited, but indeterminate continuance of life after death in its practical application had essentially the same value and effect as the belief in immortality. Yet Panaetius, who lived about the middle of the second century B.C. in the Scipionic circle at Rome and later at Athens, always enjoyed a great reputation and exercised great influence, especially on the Romans who were inclined to Stoicism, diverged in this, as in other points, from the tradition of the school. He absolutely denied life after death, and Cornutus, the teacher of Persius, expressed an equally decided opinion that the individual soul died and perished with its body, while Marcus Aurelius wavered between the ideas of an extinction of the soul at death and a passage into another existence. Amongst the Peripatetics, to whom Panaetius attached himself by preference, Dicaearchus, who was taught by Aristotle himself, also denied the continued existence of the soul, which he regarded as the result of the mixture of the corporeal substances, dependent for its very existence upon the body, and pervading all its parts. Aristotle himself certainly taught the continued existence of the thinking spirit, but not of the person or individual; and he expressly rejected the idea that the dead (called 'the blessed', οἱ μακαρῖται, by the people of Greece) could be happy. Of the later Peripatetics Strato of Lampsacus, the pupil of Theophrastus, to all appearance entirely abandoned the belief in immortality; and Alexander of Aphrodisias (time of the Severi), who has been honoured with the name of a second Aristotle, has attempted to show that Aristotle also denied immortality.

But there was also a philosophy which affirmed immor-

tality as emphatically as Epicureanism denied it. This was Platonism, the only philosophy which undertook to prove it scientifically, since to the Pythagoreans the theory of the immortality and transmigration of souls was rather a dogma than a philosophical principle. As Platonism in general irresistibly attracted those whose minds were set on things above the earth, its theory of the soul in particular was a comfort and consolation to all who needed, in addition to a belief in immortality, a philosophical proof of their convictions. Cato of Utica, also, the 'perfect Stoic', as Cicero calls him, whose death made him an ideal figure in later Stoicism, read the *Phaedo* of Plato before committing suicide. Certainly Plato's proof of immortality could convince no one who was not already convinced, and Strato's criticism had shown it to be inconclusive; but the name and reputation of Plato were a guarantee of the truth of his doctrine, that satisfied Cicero and certainly most people, who preferred to err with him than to recognize the truth with his opponents. 'It is impossible to estimate how much his dialogues have done to strengthen, spread and develop the belief in immortality, with varying success in the course of centuries, but without interruption down to our own days'. 'Posterity has correctly judged him as the type of the priest and sage, who with warning hand points the way upwards to the immortal human spirit, from this poor earth to the eternal light.

In his belief that he could scientifically prove the imperishability of the soul, Plato allowed himself to be increasingly influenced in his ideas of its destiny before and after its life in the body by the mystical theories of the Orphico-Pythagorean sects. The Orphic communities worshipped above other gods the Thracian Bacchus (Dionysus), and his ecstatic cult contained the deeply rooted conviction 'that a god lived in the human form, and could only be set free by the bursting asunder of the chains of the body'. In connexion with this conviction was developed the effort to detach oneself from the earthly and perishable by means of asceticism (the so-called Orphic life), which determined the direction of the belief and mental attitude of these mystic separatists. The belief in a compensating justice in the next world is also indebted to them for its elaboration and confirmation. These theories, which travelled from Thrace by way of Greece

to lower Italy and Sicily, blended with those of the Pythagorean communities, and in that form, which continued unaltered for centuries, were widely adopted throughout the Greek world. The most important of the Orphico-Pythagorean dogmas was the theory of the transmigration of souls, the cycle of continual new birth which the soul must traverse, in order to do penance for its falling away to the corporeal and to regain its divine nature. Consequently it is not death, but life, which is held to be the wages of sin. After its earthly life the soul awaits judgment in Hades, in accordance with which the pious look forward to a blessed existence in company with the gods of the underworld, sinners to punishments in Tartarus, which in the eschatological poems of the Orphists are described in all their horror, 'with the object of terrifying, converting, and awakening mankind'. Plato appropriated both the doctrine of the transmigration of souls and their punishments, which were regarded partly as purificatory (especially by means of fire, a theory also adopted by Origen and elevated by Gregory I. to a dogma) and partly as eternal, and attached great value to an emphatic announcement of them.

Virgil also was indebted to Orphism for the main features of his portrait of the underworld, especially the descriptions of Elysium, Tartarus and the valley of Lethe (where the souls that are to enter new bodies first drink forgetfulness of the old). Similarly Plutarch in his description of the other world, has drawn upon Orphic literature; after the example of Plato, he gives it in the form of a vision of a dead man restored to life, whose soul has preserved the recollection of its impressions while separated from the body. The abode of the blessed is like a grotto of Bacchus, decked with verdure and flowers of every kind, which exhales a gentle fragrance that intoxicates the soul like wine, and is full of Bacchic pleasure, laughter, jest and song. At the place of torture the punishments for offences are of three classes. The mildest are for those who have already done penance on earth. But he who arrives from his life on earth unpunished and unpurified, is tormented until every passion is eradicated by pains and tortures, which surpass those of the flesh in violence and severity as much as the reality surpasses the dream in clearness. The scars and weals of the passions remain in

some cases longer than in others; hence the colours of the souls are varied and manifold. A blood-red colour shows cruelty; a bluish, that sensuality has been eradicated, and so on. The colour indicates the end of purification and punishment; after it has disappeared the soul becomes bright and of one colour. At the place of the severest punishments is heard the sound of the mournful wailing of souls, which are enduring the most cruel tortures. The narrator sees the soul of his father, full of marks and scars, coming forth from a chasm and stretching out his hands to him, while it is being dragged away by its tormentors to fresh penances (he had poisoned certain persons without having been found out during his lifetime). He sees a number of souls in coils of two, three or more like snakes, and devouring each other. Further, there are three lakes, of boiling gold, cold lead, and rough iron, in which demons, like smiths, dip the souls of the avaricious, and pull them out again with their implements. Having been made red-hot and transparent in the lake of gold, they become as hard as hailstones in the lake of lead, and black and brittle in the lake of iron, so that, when broken and crushed, they assume new forms, and are thrown again into the lake of gold, suffering indescribable torments during these changes. Many, who thought their punishment was ended, were carried away to fresh tortures, at the instance of the souls of their descendants, who had been obliged to do penance for their ancestors' crimes during their lifetime. Finally, he sees the souls of those who, that they may be born again in the bodies of animals, are violently transformed by their tormentors with various instruments. Amongst them is the soul of Nero, which in addition to other tortures is pierced with red-hot nails. It was intended for the body of a viper, but at the bidding of a loud voice, which suddenly issued from a blaze of light, the body of some tame animal, which sings and lives by marshes and lakes (perhaps a toad), was assigned to it as a habitation: 'for the gods owed Nero a reward, for having bestowed freedom upon the Hellenes, the best and most god-favoured people of all his subjects'.

Traces of the widespread acceptance of the Orphic doctrine are also to be found in epitaphs. Such is the prayer addressed to the god of the underworld, Aidoneus or Osiris,

the Egyptian lord of the soul, that he would bestow cold water upon the deceased, by which is meant the water of life. The gold leaves (which the dead appear to have held in their hands), found in graves at Thurii and Petelia (about the third century B.C.) and at Eleutherae in Crete (about the second century A.D.), show that the formulae, which the consecrated one was obliged to be familiar with on his entry into Hades, in order to obtain the water of life, were always put into the grave with him, for many centuries in the same manner. The Christians also retained the idea, but not in its original significance. 'Cooling' (*refrigerium*) is with them a typical designation for the state of the blessed after death, and the prayer for this cooling is addressed not only to Christ, but also to martyrs.

Also the idea of an elevation of the soul into aether, to the stars, to the neighbourhood of the gods, which had its origin 'in religious presentiments as much as in philosophical speculations', was compatible with Orphico-Pythagorean doctrines. It appears gradually to have ousted the idea of a place under the earth for the pious, and under the influence of Stoic views to have found the widest acceptance in later times. Statius leaves it undecided whether his father's soul has soared to the heights above and, sojourning in the regions of light, is following the paths of the stars, or whether he is dwelling in the fields of Lethe amongst the heroes of the past and the shades of the departed. Yet in some epitaphs the latter idea is expressly rejected: the soul of the dead is not in the underworld amongst the shades of the departed, but has risen to the stars. To the same effect the younger Pliny says of the Emperor Trajan's dead father: his abode is either amongst the stars or near them, whence he looks down upon his son and rejoices in his fame and glory.

In the first centuries of the Christian era the majority of the educated classes of the Roman world were probably as little affected by the mystical doctrines of religious sects as by those of the different philosophical schools. They adhered to no single philosophical system, but according to their individual needs formed their opinion of the world by means of eclecticism, and were only indirectly or to a small extent influenced by philosophy in general. Some did not even feel the need of being firmly convinced on the subject

of immortality, while others had abandoned the idea in despair. The diametrically opposite results at which the different philosophical tendencies had arrived, the assault upon the principles supported by the most reputed teachers delivered by others of equal repute, were bound to lead the sceptically minded in particular to the conclusion that the scientific investigation of this subject was a task beyond human powers. This was the view held even by a man like Socrates, although he was naturally inclined to believe in a life after death. It was very natural that those inquirers, who made the body the subject of their investigation, should feel the gravest doubts as to the immateriality of the soul. The physician Galen, although anything but a materialist and a declared opponent of Epicurus, regarded the Platonic idea of the immateriality of the soul with great suspicion. How should incorporeal substances be distinguished from one another? he asks; how can an incorporeal nature pervade the body? how can it be so affected by the body, as happens in regard to the soul in cases of madness, drunkenness and similar circumstances? 'He does not presume to decide this point, any more than he intends to affirm or deny immortality'.

Quintilian also considers the question, whether the soul when released from the body is immortal or at least continues to exist for a certain time, as one that has not been decided. Tacitus was equally unconvinced at the time when, in his mature years, he wrote the life of Agricola. He concludes with the wish that the deceased may rest in peace, 'if there is a place for the spirits of the pious; if, as the wise believe, great souls are not annihilated with the body'. In these last words he alludes to the doctrine of Chrysippus, that only the souls of the wise will endure till the conflagration of the world. Even Cicero, who attached such high importance to the belief in immortality, did not consider it superfluous to allay men's fears of death, in the event of the soul perishing with the body.

But although Cicero recognized that doubt was justifiable, he was himself firmly convinced that the soul was immortal. His reasons were probably exactly the same as those of the majority of believers among the educated classes; they were based, not so much upon dogmas or scientific proofs, as upon instincts, needs and feelings, partly characteristic

of human nature in general, and partly developed by the special influences of Roman civilization. For, although Cicero reproduces in detail the Platonic proof of immortality, he expressly states (as already observed) that he considers the conviction of a Plato enough for him, even unsupported by argument, and to all appearance he adduces this proof more for the satisfaction of others than for his own. His belief, like that of all kindred natures, was based above all upon a lofty conception of the greatness and dignity of the human intellect, upon admiration and reverence for its powers and performances. He was convinced that the intellect, which had invented language and writing, associated man with man, measured the orbits of the stars, created civilization, the arts, poetry and philosophy, could not possibly be of an earthly and perishable nature. Its power, wisdom, inventiveness and memory appeared to him divine; its origin could not be an earthly one, it must be derived from heaven, and therefore divine. In this conviction he was confirmed by the agreement of all peoples, which on this point was as complete as on the belief in divinities; further, by the belief of the greatest intellects of his own nation and by the recognition of immortality in the religious cult of the dead, observed without alteration for so many centuries. Further proofs, according to him, were to be found in the anxiety of men as to what would become of them after death, the sacrifice of the best amongst them for posterity, and the general and natural desire for recognition by posterity and for posthumous renown. Everywhere and at all times it was just the men who were most distinguished in character and intellect who had acted as men would only act with the prospect of immortality before them; and it is in the belief held by the noblest and best that we are most likely to discover a knowledge of the truth. Cicero has expressed his belief in personal immortality almost poetically in the *Dream of Scipio*, in which he describes the blessedness enjoyed by the mighty dead of the past in celestial spheres, after they have been uplifted from the prison of the body to the true and eternal life.

But certainly all the hopes of a life beyond the grave which were not founded upon religious convictions were persistently vague. This is shown in particular by the example of Seneca,

who nevertheless professed his adherence to a Stoicism that taught the doctrine of immortality, and who in addition was greatly in favour of the Platonic views of the question. There was a time in his life when immortality appeared as inconceivable and undesirable to him as to Epicurus, of whom he held the highest opinion. In one of his tragedies he says : ' He who has set foot on the waters of the river of the dead, exists no more. As the dirty smoke from the kindled fires ascends and vanishes after its brief journey, and as the fury of arctic Boreas drives before it and dissipates the clouds heavily charged with rain, so the spirit, which animates our bodies and regulates the term of existence, will pass away ; after death there is nothing—death itself is nothing, only the most recent arrival or goal reached, in the velocity of space. Let the avaricious discard their hopes and let the anxious set aside their fears. Dost thou betray any curiosity to know where thou shalt rest after death ? Where those rest who have not come into existence at all. Repacious time swallows us up, and we merge into Chaos. Death is the inseparable bugbear of the body, nor does it spare the soul any more than it does the body. Taenarum—and the kingdom under that relentless ruler, and the dog Cerberus which blocks the way and guards the difficult approach—all this is empty talk and idle words, like the terrors revealed during a frightful nightmare ' (*Troades,* 392–411, trans. W. Bradshaw). Although Seneca perhaps did not long adhere to this uncompromising attitude of denial, he never attained a firm and undoubting belief in immortality. He writes to his friend Lucilius the Epicurean, whose last letter had awakened him from a pleasant dream, that he was on the point of accepting the consoling belief in the immortality of the soul and of adopting the opinions of great men, which certainly promised more than they proved ; on the receipt of Lucilius' letter he awoke, the beautiful dream vanished, and yet he would like it to return. In fact, in the conclusion of his letter he looks forward to a longer and better life to which the earthly life is only a prelude. Then will the secrets of nature be revealed to us, the heavens, which the soul chained to the body can only endure from a distance, will be lighted up on all sides alike, night will no longer succeed day, and we shall recognize that we lived in darkness, as long as the

divine light only penetrated to us through the narrow medium of the eyes. If we compare the conclusion with the beginning of the letter, we can hardly doubt that the confidence which he here displays was assumed. In fact, he declares often enough in his latest writings that it is doubtful whether there is another life, whether the soul continues to exist, whether death is only a transition or the end. We could only be certain of its nature and effect, if a man were to rise from the dead. But Seneca knew of no man who had so risen.

Philosophical speculation could only give an assurance of continued existence in combination with religious belief, as in the case of Pythagoreanism and Platonism. Certainly a considerable number of educated men entirely abandoned a philosophical proof of immortality. and sought and found consolation and peace of mind in regard to the other life in religion alone. Vast numbers of people, such as Plutarch's wife Timoxena, derived their firm belief in immortality from the Orphico-Dionysiac mysteries, which were widely diffused throughout the entire Greek world and were especially in vogue in the second century A.D. But of all the Greek mysteries the Eleusinian maintained the reputation of being the most sacred festival of grace, and the celebration of the sacred night was perhaps most thronged in the last days of antiquity. Throughout the Roman empire foreign (Thracian, Phrygian, Egyptian, Syrian, Persian) secret cults became more and more attractive, owing to the charm exercised by the mysterious, especially if unfamiliar; certainly all of them promised immortal happiness to their votaries. Those who were consecrated to the service of Isis and Mithras were called 'born again', 'born again to eternity'. The essence of the worship of Mithras was perhaps the old Persian belief in a resurrection of the dead.

Amongst the evidences of the belief in immortality and the hope of a higher existence must be reckoned numerous figurative representations on funeral urns and altars, sarcophagi, and other monuments, of which the most artistically adorned could only have been within the reach of the well-to-do, that is, generally speaking, the better educated. Certainly the language of these images and figures is not always intelligible; the artistic production of the age, which as a

rule endeavoured to satisfy the new requirements of art by borrowing from the immense stock of existing creations, in this case also frequently employed older representations with a new meaning. The great mass of mythological scenes, so rich in figures, with which the front sides of the sarcophagi are adorned, belongs to these ancient creations ; the majority of them date from the period from the second to the fourth century, and in many cases (perhaps as a rule) were not made to order, but were executed for buyers to choose from, in accordance with the prevailing demand. If the connexion of the myths represented with death, immortality and the other world cannot always be proved with certainty, and perhaps sometimes the only object was to fill up the empty spaces with favourite representations, yet in the majority of cases there can be no doubt of the idea with which they were selected for this purpose. The figures of the myths are, as it were, poetical types for the symbolical expression of abstract ideas ; and even here the prevailing tendency of Greek art and poetry to transfigure human existence by elevating it into the regions of the ideal, is manifest. Only rarely (as in the fable of Prometheus) is the union and separation of soul and body represented ; usually the transition to another life and its happiness or misery is symbolized by the destinies of the gods and heroes. The rape of Proserpine to the shades and her return to the world of light, the death of Adonis succeeded by his resurrection, were favourite subjects ; perhaps the carrying off of the daughters of Leucippus by the Dioscuri to a higher existence had a similar significance. The stories of Admetus and Alcestis, of Protesilaus and Laodamia, indicate the hope of a meeting again after death and the continuance of conjugal love beyond the grave. Hercules, the hero who after incessant struggles frees himself from the infirmities of mortality and proves victorious even over the powers of the underworld, appears in his combats and labours as a real victor over death. Achilles in Scyros, who preferred a brief and glorious life to a long and inglorious one, and was rewarded for his choice by removal to Elysium, is apparently intended to be a guarantee of the reward which awaits virtue ; the stories of Actaeon, Marsyas, Clytaemnestra, and the battle of the giants, are perhaps warnings of the punishments which overtake sinners. The delights of the blessed are indicated by the

joyous meetings, dances, and festivities of the crowd which forms the retinue of Bacchus, the motley throng of Bacchants, Maenads, Satyrs, Pans and Centaurs, whose exuberance of life, on sarcophagi and urns, gets the better of death : ' the ashes appear still to be enjoying life in their peaceful abode ' (Goethe). The god himself by his resurrection, according to the Orphic doctrine, guaranteed immortality to those who had been initiated into his mysteries ; Ariadne, raised by him to heaven, was regarded as an example of the soul freed from mortality and removed to a higher world. The companies and bands of the Nereids and marine divinities, rocking themselves on the waves of the sea, and the sports of the love-gods (Ἔρωτες, Cupidines) appear to represent the condition of the blessed. In 1857 and 1858 two stately, two-storied mausoleums (constructed in the second half of the second century A.D.) were discovered facing one another on opposite sides of the Via Latina at Rome. The arched roof of the chief chamber in the lower story of one, which contains three sarcophagi, is richly ornamented with stucco reliefs ; a medallion in the centre represents the soul of the deceased as a veiled figure carried by a griffin, and is surrounded by twenty-four other medallions with Bacchants, Nereids and love-gods in small square fields. In a Latin poem, found near Philippi, on the death of a boy it is said that the women dedicated to Bacchus would now take him into their company as a satyr in a flowery meadow, or the nymphs in their torch-light dances.

Whether the belief in immortality found more opponents than supporters even amongst the small minority of educated persons, cannot be determined ; but there can be no question that at all times a vast majority amongst the masses in the main held firmly to the ideas of the immortality of the soul, propagated from primitive times through successive centuries, notwithstanding all the modifications which had been introduced in the course of time. The belief of man in his continued existence is one of the strongest and commonest instincts and needs of the human soul. This is confirmed generally by the study of the customs of primitive peoples and of the oldest civilized peoples, although exceptions are not wanting ; amongst the Indo-Germanic nations, in particular, this belief goes back far beyond the beginnings of

tradition. Belief in immortality is as much in keeping with human nature as belief in the rule of higher beings ; it springs from the dread of annihilation ; the impulse of self-preservation in this case instinctively extends beyond the grave. Man, awakened to consciousness, seeks in the next world the solution of the enigmas of life, consolation for his sufferings and disappointments, ' at the grave he plants the seed of hope '. Only a minority is capable of reflection, which leads to doubt and denial. The longing for annihilation, with which for so many centuries millions in Asia have been filled, springs from fear, not of immortality in itself, but of the torture of endless re-births.

Certainly, as in all ages, currents of materialism reached the masses in later Graeco-Roman antiquity ; but neither the analogy of similar experiences in modern times nor the comparatively small number of materialistic or sceptical epitaphs of persons of the lower classes justifies the assumption that they ever made much progress or injured positive belief to any considerable extent. In contrast to such epitaphs, others express a firm confidence in immortality and reunion after death ; for example, the inscription on the common grave of a married couple, of whom the wife had died first : ' I am waiting for my husband '. But, in particular, there is abundant and absolutely trustworthy evidence that the popular belief on the whole, so far as Graeco-Roman culture extended, was still determined by the original Roman and Greek ideas of the other world, which in the course of centuries had variously amalgamated.

Certainly, Roman writers have asserted at different times, that no one believed in the old popular fables of the underworld. No old woman, says Cicero, is so weak-minded as to be afraid of ' the Acherontian depths of Orcus, the pale realm of death wrapped in darkness '. No one, says Seneca, is so childish as to fear Cerberus and the darkness and the ghostly figures of the skeletons of the dead. Only quite young children, who as yet pay no entrance money to the baths, believe that there are departed spirits, and subterranean realms, a Cocytus and black frogs in the Stygian abyss, and that so many thousands cross the river in a bark. In any case it is true that the Greek ideas, to which these passages chiefly refer, were less generally accepted in Italy and the western

lands, although there also the reading of poetry in all the schools, theatrical performances and the plastic art, must have favoured their propagation, which was undoubtedly underestimated by the authors cited. Yet Lucretius could say that the fear of Acheron troubles man's life from its inmost depths, throws the dark shadow of death over all and allows no pleasure to be pure and unalloyed ; certainly in his pictures of the universally dreaded tortures and ' eternal punishments ' in Tartarus the Orphic descriptions of the underworld may have been before his mind.

Juvenal could hardly have been serious in denying the persistence of the Roman popular belief in the spirits of the departed ; his idea seems to have been to represent only its coarser elements as entirely abandoned, and even in this he is certainly wrong. Like all enlightened intellects, he is only too ready to assume the opinions that prevailed in his own circles to be the only ones that are reasonably possible and consequently universally admitted. But least of all was Juvenal in a position to deny the general belief in immortality. No one will dispute that he must at least have known as much about the views of his educated contemporaries as ourselves.

In regard to one at least of the Greek fables ridiculed by Juvenal we know that it was widely believed in, even in the west. This is the fable of the ' grim ferryman of the muddy pool ', as Juvenal calls him, to whom the dead man is obliged to present his obol in his mouth as passage money. That the people in Greek countries generally believed in the existence of the ferryman of the dead is expressly attested by Lucian : ' the mass is so preoccupied with this idea that, when a man dies, his relatives hasten to put an obol into his mouth to pay the ferryman for his passage across the Styx, without first finding out what money is current in the underworld ', and so on. Even at the present day this custom exists in Greece, and Charon still survives, although in altered form, in the popular belief and songs under the name of Charontas or Charos, a god of death and the underworld generally. Sometimes he appears as an archer, sometimes as a reaper, sometimes as a monstrous ghostly horseman escorting the hosts of the dead, sometimes as an eagle swooping down upon its prey, and sometimes (but rarely) as the ferryman of the dead How

general and deeply rooted must that belief have been, which has given proof of such indestructible vitality, in spite of the fact that, for fifteen hundred years, all the conditions necessary for its continuance were lacking! Originally, to all appearance, the piece of money given to the dead man to take with him was a symbol of the purchase of his entire property, which he was supposed to take with him intact. This obviously ancient custom, which persisted with remarkable tenacity in many countries of the Roman empire to a late period, indeed, through the middle ages and down to our own times, was brought into connexion with the idea of the ferryman of the dead, and this explanation (of the obol as passage-money) became a popular belief.

If, therefore, there can be no doubt that a thing which, according to Juvenal, only little children believed, was in reality believed by thousands and thousands in the Roman empire, we have as little right to doubt the persistence and propagation of the other popular ideas of the underworld. Cicero's, Seneca's and Juvenal's assurances to the contrary may be confronted with the equally positive assurance of Lucian. He says that the great mass of the common people imagined the other world exactly as the poets had described it. It was a monstrous, gloomy kingdom of the dead, ruled by Pluto and Proserpine, with Cocytus and Pyriphlegethon, the Acherusian lake, the adamantine gate guarded by Aeacus and Cerberus, the asphodel meadow with the river of Lethe, the judges of the dead, who send the good into Elysium and hand over the wicked to the tortures of the Furies, while those who were neither good nor wicked wander as shades over the asphodel meadow, living upon the gifts and sacrifices offered to the dead. Plutarch says that those who feared the teeth of Cerberus and the cask of the daughters of Danaus, sought protection against them in consecrations and purifications, whereby they thought to obtain a guarantee that they would continue to live in Hades in a clear spot and pure air, in the midst of jest and dance. He certainly was of opinion that 'not many' believed these 'old wives' fables'; but of course his estimate was subjective and determined by accidental impressions, like that of Lucian, to whom the number of believers appeared to be very large. Thus the statements of both are equally unreliable. But we can hardly suppose

that the ideas of the great multitude in regard to life after death were more enlightened than those of a man like Aristides, who nevertheless appears to have believed that those who had not been initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries would lie in the underworld surrounded by mud and darkness. In his essay *On Superstition*, Plutarch enumerates amongst its hallucinations the ideas of the deep gates of Hades, of the streams of fire and steep precipices of the Styx, of a darkness full of ghosts, where frightful forms appear and piteous cries are to be heard, of judges and executioners, of gulfs and abysses, that conceal a thousand torments ; and the fact that he himself regarded superstition as a widespread evil, is the result (as already observed) of the eagerness with which he combats it.

We may suppose that many, if not most, Greek ideas passed into the popular belief of the West, especially when we consider the effect exercised by the Roman poets through the schools. From the time of Ennius, detailed descriptions of the underworld were a favourite subject with epic (perhaps also tragic) poets, and that of Virgil before all others probably influenced, both directly and indirectly, the ideas of a vast multitude.

No proofs are needed to show that the ideas of a more or less material existence of the departed, such as is assumed in the old fables handed down from time immemorial, were as widespread amongst the masses as the fables themselves. The vast majority of mankind at that time were even less capable than they are now of exercising the faculty of abstraction, which the idea of a purely spiritual existence requires. In every attempt to portray the unknown life the imagination left to itself was, and still is, obliged to work, involuntarily and unconsciously, with colours and forms borrowed from the life with which it is acquainted, and its most refined and most ethereal images are no more immaterial than the rudest and grossest. It was in the nature of things that the latter should be the only ones which the great multitude could comprehend and retain. All the less reason, therefore, is there to doubt the assertion of Lucian, that many believed that the dead really lived on the gifts, sacrifices and meals offered them by those who survived them ; that many ordered their belongings, clothes and jewellery to be burnt or buried with them, in the belief that they would need them in the

next world or would be able to derive some benefit from them. In fact, a great part of the articles of domestic life preserved in our museums comes from graves, in which were deposited the soldier's weapons, the artist's and artisan's tools, the women's toilette articles, and the child's playthings. The orator Regulus ordered his fourteen-year-old son's numerous teams of driving ponies, his riding ponies, his large and small dogs, his nightingales, parrots and blackbirds to be burnt on his funeral pyre. In Lucian's *Philopseudes* a husband tells how he has shown his love for his deceased wife not only during her life but also at her death by burning all her clothes and jewellery with her; yet on the seventh day, while he was reading Plato's *Phaedo*, she appeared, and complained that one of her gilded sandals had not been burnt with her. She indicated the spot under a chest where it was; when found, it was burnt in accordance with her desire. The objects to be buried with the dead were frequently defined by will. The will (first century) of a wealthy Roman in the district of the modern Langres gives instructions (perhaps in accordance with old Celtic usage) that all his hunting and fowling appliances are to be burnt with him—lances, swords, knives, nets, snares, lime-twigs, bird-lime, hunting tents, etc., litters and sedan-chairs, a boat made of reeds, all his variegated and embroidered clothes and all the chairs (?) of elk's horns. The same will orders the planting of orchards near the grave, which are to be continually tended by three gardeners and their apprentices; gardens, vineyards, and parks were very frequently laid out near graves, 'in order that the departed souls might enjoy the beauties of nature'. An inscription at Cirta says: On my tumulus bees shall sip the thyme blossoms, the birds shall sing pleasantly to me in verdant grottoes; there buds the laurel, and golden bunches of grapes hang on the vines. We may well believe that many of the extant testamentary dispositions which refer to the adornment and cult of the graves were made in the belief that the departed were able to take an interest in the joys and pleasures of this world, and certainly very often in the belief that they continued to lead a material existence, especially in the vicinity of their graves.

After all that has been said, no further proof is needed of the widespread belief in immortality even in the later days

of antiquity. Besides, it is sufficiently shown by a single fact which has hitherto not been taken into consideration: the equally widespread belief in apparitions, and consequently in the possibility of the return of the dead, in a general intimate connexion of the world of spirits with the world of the living, in a constant influence of the former upon the latter. This was a very ancient belief among both Greeks and Romans; but our knowledge of its development and of the forms which it assumed amongst the two peoples is incomplete. The idea that the good spirits of the departed acted as protecting spirits of the living, crops up in the oldest Greek poetry. For instance, Hesiod says that the souls of the men of the golden age, after its close, became good spirits ('demons') who, wrapped in mist, wander over the earth as guardians of mortal men, keep watch over justice and injustice, and distribute wealth; but nothing more is heard of this idea until the time when the later Platonism amalgamated it with its theory of demons. The corrpesonding belief in the spirits of the wicked as *larvae* and *lemures*, 'tormented themselves and tormenting others', can, on the other hand, only be shown to have been general and firmly held amongst the Romans. But in other respects the two peoples are commonly in agreement as to the belief in spirits. Among both the belief was chiefly connected with the spirits of those who had died a violent death, whose implacable wrath pursues and destroys even the innocent, and of those who remained unburied. Even if, in later times, the Greek and Roman belief in spirits, in consequence of an interchange of ideas, tended to approximate more and more, the former lacks the firm support, the definite form and direction, which the latter received from a public cult. The idea of an uninterrupted mutual intercourse between the upper and lower worlds was supported and strengthened in Roman popular belief especially by the opening of the *mundus* (i.e. the deep circular pit, which in every city was consecrated to the gods and spirits of the lower world, also regarded as gods of sowing) on three days in the year (August 24, October 5, November 8), when the hosts of 'the silent ones' could go in and come out unhindered; then the festival of All Souls on February 21 (*Feralia*) and the *Parentalia* in the preceding week (13–20), the neglect of which, according to the legend, was fol-

lowed by a terrible mortality ; lastly, the usages whereby it was attempted to appease and conciliate the ghostly visitants during the three nights of the *Lemuria* (9, 11, and 13 May).

The intimate and mutual connexion of belief in immortality with the belief in ghosts, the eagerness to accept the latter in support and confirmation of the former, and the fact that sceptics were convinced, or ready to be convinced, by apparitions, need no explanation. The author of the *Homilies* of the so-called Clement of Rome relates that, when tormented by doubts as to immortality, he desired to be incontestably convinced by the actual sight of a departed soul. He thought of journeying to Egypt and persuading a magician to conjure up a dead man ; but on being reminded by a philosopher that this was not only forbidden by law, but was an act hateful to God, he abandoned his intention. A monument erected by a certain Tiberius Claudius Panoptes and his wife Charmosyne to their two daughters 'after a vision', bears the inscription: 'Thou who readest this and doubtest whether there are *Manes*, make a wager with us, and thou wilt soon learn the truth'. But even in educated circles belief in ghosts and in immortality often went hand in hand. It is true, however, that not only all those who held or were inclined to Epicurean or materialistic views, ridiculed the nightly wanderings of the *Lemures*, dreams, miracles, witches and magic, and declared that only women, children and delirious invalids saw ghosts, but a large number of those who believed in immortality (e.g. Seneca) doubted or rejected the idea of the appearance of ghosts.

But whether they formed the majority even in philosophically educated circles (especially after the second century), is by no means certain. The company of Eucrates described by Lucian in the *Philopseudes* have not the slightest doubt that there are 'demons and ghosts, and that the souls of the dead wander about on the earth and appear to as many as they please'. This company consisted of a physician, a Peripatetic, a Stoic, a Platonist and a holy Pythagorean ; Eucrates himself was a man who had thoroughly studied philosophy. The neo-Pythagoreans and Pythagorizing Platonists, who found in apparitions a guarantee of the truth not only of their belief in immortality but also of their demonology, were the firmest believers in ghosts. The philoso-

phizing rhetorician Maximus of Tyre, whose views are founded entirely upon a Platonism already inclining to neo-Platonism, like all those who shared his opinions, regards the demons (including departed souls) as the real bond between the sensual and super-sensual world. The souls that have become demons, he says, are grieved at their past and happy in their present life; they are also distressed at the lot of kindred souls, who still linger on earth, and in their love of mankind desire to associate with them and to hold them up when they slip. And they are commissioned by the divinity to visit the earth and to take an interest in every human birth, in the destinies, thoughts and actions of men, to help the good, to assist those who suffer wrong, and to punish those who do evil. He relates, without expressing the least doubt, that the inhabitants of Ilium often saw Hector with glittering arms bounding at full speed over the plain, and that Achilles often appeared to mariners on the little island in the Black Sea before the mouth of the Danube, where as a glorified hero he had a sanctuary: some beheld him advancing in the form of a young man with fair hair in golden armour, others heard him singing a battle song, while others both heard and saw him. Achilles himself had awakened a sailor who had fallen asleep on the island, led him to his tent and given him hospitality; Patroclus poured out the wine, Achilles played the *cithara*, and Thetis and a band of demons were present. Apuleius has handled the theory of demons with special affection. The human soul also is included amongst the demons in their capacity of mediators between the earthly and the higher world; the souls of the good and just after death act as protecting spirits on earth; those of the bad are condemned to perpetual wandering as *larvae*, 'harmless bugbears to good men, but destructive to bad'. In his defence against the charge of magic he utters the following imprecation against his accuser, by whom he had been falsely accused of using the figure of a skeleton for magical purposes: 'May the God (Mercury) who wanders backwards and forwards between the upper and the lower worlds, bring upon you the displeasure of the gods of both in requital for this lie; may you ever see before you the figures of the dead, and all the shades, *Lemures*, *Manes*, and *Larvae* that there are, all the nocturnal apparitions,

all the ghosts of the tombs, all the terrors of the places where the dead have been burnt'. An inscription at Puteoli concludes with the words: 'May the wrath of the shades of those who lie buried here visit him who moves this stone from its place'. Plutarch, in his dedication of the biographies of Dio and Brutus to Sossius Senecio, in order to refute those who disbelieved in apparitions, appealed to the authority of those who foretold the end of these two men, so strong-minded and philosophical, as they themselves admitted. He quotes the statement of others (apparently without disbelieving it) that a ghost had haunted, and continued to haunt, a bath at Chaeronea, where in Lucullus's time a murder had been committed. But the belief in spirits and demons was also compatible with other philosophical opinions than those of Platonism. The Cynic Peregrinus Proteus, who according to Lucian threw himself into the flames with the cry, 'O demons of my mother and father, receive me graciously!' had spread the report that after his death he was destined to become a demon who afforded protection by night; and there could be no doubt that a number of people would be simple enough to declare that they had met him at night or that they had been cured of fever by him. The younger Pliny, whose views were chiefly determined by Stoicism (he had been intimate with the Stoics Euphrates and Artemidorus), begs his friend Licinius Sura (consul 102) to give him his opinion as to whether there were such things as ghosts and whether they had a form of their own and a superhuman nature (*numen*), or whether they were merely idle fancies, which received their shape from our own fears. He believed the former, and amongst other proofs told a ghost story, which is very like that of the Pythagorean Arignotus in Lucian's *Philopseudes*. A large house at Athens was rendered uninhabitable by a ghost that haunted it every night; the spirit appeared in the form of an emaciated old man with a long beard and chains on his hands and feet, which rattled terribly. At last a philosopher named Athenodorus had the courage to face the ghost, which beckoned to him till he took a light and followed it; in the court it suddenly disappeared. On the following day the spot was dug up and a skeleton in chains was found; after it had been duly buried the ghost was never seen again. Pliny believes this story,

he says, on the assurance of others, and narrates another, even still more childish, as an undoubted fact which occurred during his own lifetime. Pliny's friend Suetonius says that before Caligula's interment it was well-known that the keepers of the Lamian gardens, whither his body had been brought, were alarmed by ghosts, and that the house in which he died was regularly haunted by night until it was burnt down. The writings of Pausanias provide further examples of a strong belief in spirits amongst educated men in the second century; and yet his belief is, if possible, surpassed by the ghost-mania of Philostratus and Cassius Dio. What the former tells us of the appearances and exhibitions of power by the heroes of the Trojan war may be regarded as having been essentially borrowed from popular tradition. According to him the figures of the Homeric heroes appeared to the herdsman of the Trojan plain, as big as giants, in warlike array, especially Hector, who performed marvels, and Protesilaus among the Greek heroes, who was still alive. He was now in Hades, now in his home Phylace in Phthia (where he also imparted oracles), now in Troas; he appeared at midday, healed the sick, and gave aid in the torments of love; he blinded an adversary by his appearance. Cassius Dio repeatedly reports quite seriously that on great occasions the dead rose *en masse* from their graves, e.g. at the battle of Actium and Nero's attempt to dig a channel through the isthmus of Corinth. He relates that in the year 220 a spirit, which called itself that of Alexander the Great, exactly resembled him in form and features and wore a similar dress, marched with a retinue of 400 men dressed as Bacchants from the Danube to the Bosporus, where it disappeared; no official ventured to stop it, but on the contrary, lodging and food were everywhere provided for it at the public expense.

A widespread and absolute belief in ghosts in higher and educated circles may also be inferred from the frequent mention of spells to call up the spirits of the dead. These incantations seem very frequently to have been the cause of horrible crimes, since enchantment was supposed chiefly to have power over the souls of those who had died a violent death, especially if premature; hence, murders, particularly of children, were only too often committed with this object. Amongst the Roman Emperors Nero, Caracalla, Didius

Julianus and Elagabalus (Heliogabalus) practised this kind of magic. Dio expressly states that the two last caused children to be put to death. Caracalla, who tried every kind of magic and divination, in order to get rid of the apparitions of his father and his murdered brother, by which he was continually pursued, endeavoured to call up the spirits of the former and Commodus, but in vain; it was whispered in Rome that the shade of Geta appeared with that of Severus. For the same reason Nero called up the spirit of his mother Agrippina. He was most passionately addicted to the incantation of spirits, and since 'his dearest wish was to slaughter human beings', he may well have offered more sacrifices to his mania than any one else. Tiridates, the Parthian king who came to Rome in 66 with a retinue of magi, initiated him into the 'magic meals' and all the secrets of magic, with which, however, Nero must already have had some acquaintance. For Lucan (died 65) has inserted in his *Pharsalia* an episode of the incantation of the dead, described in luxuriantly horrible language, obviously with no other intention than to emphasize his condemnation of this mania of the Emperor, whose avowed enemy he had been since 64. It is Sextus, 'the unworthy son of the great Pompey', who endeavours to learn the future by calling up the dead; disdaining the aid of sacred prophecy and legitimate means, he had recourse to the 'horrible mysteries of the magi, those enemies of the gods' and to the terrors of the underworld; 'the gods of heaven were not omniscient enough for the wretch!' The sorceress Erichtho, who complies with his wish, is an unnatural creature, who establishes her claim to be listened to by the gods of the underworld by numerous cruel and monstrous crimes, amongst which the murder of children is expressly mentioned. The description of the ceremony itself does not produce the impression that it is a mere picture of the imagination. Its details are substantiated in almost every essential part by other similar descriptions. It is almost indispensable in such cases that the ghost should only answer questions, and not speak without being spoken to; and the choice of a dead body, whose lungs are uninjured, can hardly be a poetical invention, but appears to be a practice of those who called up spirits, which was certainly greatly favoured by believers. It is also easy to

understand the assertion that it would be easiest to revive the bodies of those who had recently died. Conjurations of the spirits of those who had long been dead probably succeeded best without witnesses. Thus the Alexandrian savant Apion summons the shade of Homer, in order to ask him in which of the seven cities which claimed the honour of his birthplace he was really born. Unfortunately, the spirit did not allow him to communicate the answer, perhaps for the same reason as the spirit of Protesilaus in Philostratus; since the zeal of the other cities in the worship of Homer would be abated.

Further, magicians made use of the spirits called forth, as well as of other demons, to torture their enemies with apparitions, to inflict pain and sickness upon them, to tie their tongues, and so on. Similar magical arts were also practised by means of incantations written on tablets of lead and laid in the graves; a number of these have been preserved. This practice is a species of the so-called 'devotion', whereby living persons were consecrated to the powers of the underworld. It is founded on the old and widespread belief that these powers exercise authority over life, which they endeavour to draw down beneath the earth; the spirits of the dead included amongst them, who, in order to appease them, were called the good or the friendly (*Dei Manes*) and had to be conciliated with sacrifices, are also invoked in the old formula of 'devotion', whereby the Roman general dedicated the army of the enemy to death. In an epitaph erected by a husband to his dead wife, he declares that he honours her remains with as much awe as a divinity. 'O dearest, spare thy husband; I implore thee, spare him, that for many years longer he may continually bring thee sacrifices and garlands, and fill the lamp with fragrant oil'. An address to a dead 'mistress or patroness' runs: 'As long as I live, I will honour thee; what will happen after my death, I know not. Spare thy mother and thy father and thy sister Marina, that she may be able to pay thee honour when I am gone!' With the same idea the dead are called upon to preserve their relatives or to pray for them to the gods of the underworld.

Even if we are only acquainted with the dark and sinister aspect of the belief in spirits at that time, it is enough to prove that the tendency to plunge into the mysteries of the next world and the world of spirits was widespread and irresis-

tible ; and even if the horrible may have constantly exercised a most irresistible attraction upon the imagination, the latter assuredly must also have busied itself in portraying the peace and rapture enjoyed by the blessed in contrast to the tortures and restlessness of the unhappy.

But certainly the consolation, which the belief in immortality afforded to that age and to antiquity generally, was very different from that offered to believers by the Christian hope of eternal happiness. The ancient belief in immortality not only lacked the incontestable security and certainty of a belief based upon revelation and consequently the firm support afforded by the latter to the imagination in its portrayal of the other life ; in addition, it was by no means so exclusively directed towards eternity as the Christian belief, but quite as much, if not to a greater extent, towards the life on earth. According to the Roman popular belief and the Platonic demonology, the reward of the good chiefly consisted not in being carried away to a super-terrestrial and blessed existence, but in taking part in the joys and sufferings of those who came after them, as guides, helpers, and protectors. Cicero could find no other explanation of the fact that, at all times and amongst all peoples, the best are ready to sacrifice themselves, than that they will be able to be witnesses even after death of the consequences of their acts and of the glory obtained by them.

The tendency of the Greek and Roman cult of the dead was to preserve unbroken the connexion between the living and the dead. The abodes of the dead were not secluded, peaceful and rarely visited resting places, like our cemeteries, but were situated before the gates of cities, on both sides of the main road, where the stream of living traffic that flowed past was at its full. As Varro says, they were intended both as a constant warning to passers-by, that they themselves would one day reach this haven, and also as an incessant reminder, not only to relatives and descendants, but to all posterity, to keep alive the memory of the departed. On gravestones this reminder often took the following form : ' O weary wanderer, who passest me by, after long wandering, here thou shalt come at last '.

In inscriptions a prayer is frequently offered for a friendly recollection of the dead : e.g. ' Titus Lollius Musculus lies here by the wayside, that passers-by may say : Greeting to

Titus Lollius'. Similarly, wanderers are requested not to begrudge an honourable and friendly greeting to the dead, who in return blesses them for the attention: 'Mayest thou who readest these lines, enjoy a healthy life, love and be loved, until thine hour comes!' Sometimes even a reply is put into the mouth of the dead, so that a kind of dialogue between him and the passer-by could be read by the latter on the gravestone.

It was commonly believed that the dead always found pleasure in such indications of sympathy on the part of all the living without distinction, and also that the sacrifices, gifts and meals offered at their graves, the floral decorations of the memorials on 'rose and violet days', the light of the freshly-filled grave-lamp and the smell of its fragrant oil, would be equally agreeable to them, if only as proofs that they were not forgotten, by posterity. All such offerings were made under the idea that it was the desire of the departed as it were to continue to live amongst future generations. The same is the meaning of the scenes from the past life of the dead represented on Greek funeral monuments: 'their existence is as it were continued and stereotyped'. The sight of these simple and touching representations, which excites our sympathy in the highest degree, most agreeably affected the spirit of Goethe, which in this respect also was akin to that of the ancients. It specially pleased him that the men represented on these gravestones did not fold their hands or look up to heaven, but stood side by side as they had stood side by side in life, as they had loved one another: 'the wind, which blows to us from the graves of the ancients, comes with sweet perfumes over a group of rose trees'. And even those who rejected or did not need the belief in a personal immortality have at all times throughout antiquity attached great value to being held in remembrance by posterity. Even Epicurus, in whose theory of happiness the principle that existence and consciousness ceases with death forms the real keystone, ordered in his will that his birthday and the 20th of every month should be kept as a festival in memory of himself and his friend Metrodorus; and the custom was observed by his followers even for centuries after his death.

But although those who believed in immortality held firmly to the idea of a continued personal existence, higher,

purer, and consequently happier, they by no means admitted such a difference between the life beyond the grave and the life on earth as the followers of Christ. Consequently, they were not so keenly opposed to unbelief and doubt. When the Greeks in popular language called the dead 'blessed', it meant that they were delivered from the troubles, sufferings and disappointments of life. Death, which brought this deliverance, did not therefore appear an evil, even if it was the end of existence. The words put by Plato (in the *Apology*) into the mouth of Socrates, addressed to his judges after his condemnation, perhaps best express the contrast between the Christian and the pagan view of the matter: Death is either an eternal sleep or the passage to a new life, but in neither case is it an evil. Both views, consequently, are consolatory, but one more so than the other.

The Christian belief regards death, not followed by resurrection to a life of happiness, as the most unhappy lot imaginable. It considers the next life as the true one, from which earthly existence receives its light, and without whose beams it would be completely dark. Happiness will not fall to the lot of man, says Lactantius, in the way philosophers have imagined. No man can be happy so long as he lives in the body, which must necessarily be dissolved by decay, but only when he lives in the spirit alone, after the soul has been freed from the companionship of the body. One thing alone can make us happy in this life, to however small an extent; we must flee from the seductions of pleasures and serve virtue alone in all our troubles and sorrows, which are exercises and confirmation in virtue; we must keep in the rough and difficult path which is left open to us, leading to happiness. Consequently, the greatest good, the possession of which bestows happiness, can only be found in religion and doctrine, which include the hope of immortality. Augustine calls eternal life the greatest good and eternal death the greatest evil. Only that man can be called happy here below, whose whole being is directed to that end, and who keeps it stedfastly in view in glowing affection and loyal hope; even then he is happier in hope than in reality. Without this hope there is only a false happiness, only misery and sorrow.

It is a view very commonly held, that the ancients set a higher value on this life, since their hopes of the life beyond

the grave could neither be so firmly established nor so clearly set forth as those of the Christians. But the general impression derived from Greek and Roman literature by no means confirms this. The innate love of existence, nourished on the ever fresh splendours of the world and on the greatness and beauty of human life, is certainly an essential element in the ancient view of life. But it is only one of its two poles, the second and opposite being a feeling of resignation arising from a deep consciousness of human misery and helplessness, whose painful and submissive expressions pervade all ancient literature. Even Homer, to whom the idea of the other world afforded absolutely no consolation, makes the supreme god say : Of all things that breathe and creep upon the earth, nothing is more miserable than man. And even if he believed that in the hell of Zeus there stand two casks, the one full of good, the other of bad, gifts, later writers imagine two casks for the bad and only one for the good ; and Simonides thought human life so full of evils, that there was no room for the air to penetrate between one suffering and another. When the mother of Cleobis and Biton asked the goddess to grant her sons what would be the best thing a man could obtain, the goddess gave them death, and, according to Herodotus, declared that death was better for man than life. This was confirmed on several occasions by the revelations of other divinities. It is during the period of the youthful and manly vigour of the Greek intellect that the idea already expressed by Theognis and amongst others by Sophocles, and put into the mouth of Heracles by Bacchylides, is repeated in various forms : the best fortune is not to be born at all ; the next best to go whence one came as soon as possible after birth. Hence (in the oft-quoted words of Euripides) we ought to pity those who are born, and to bury the dead with joy and congratulations. Even if death is a dreamless sleep, says Socrates in Plato's *Apology*, it is preferable to life ; for every one, even the Great King, when he reflects upon his life, will find that the days and nights, which he has spent better and more happily as a dreamless night, can very easily be numbered. Menander, the wittiest poet of the Alexandrine period, whose fragments give forth the dull tones of resignation, says, ' Whom the gods love, die young ' : to him sadness appeared the ' twin sister of human life ', and that man the

happiest, 'who without sorrow has looked upon the grandeur of the world, and then returned in haste to the place whence he came'.

Even Roman literature supplies expressions of a similar kind. Thus Cicero concluded his *Hortensius* with a discussion of the vanity and unhappiness of men. The errors and hardships of life, it is said, appear to justify that ancient sage, according to whom we are born to atone for sins committed in an earlier life, and also Aristotle, who recognized that the combination of soul and body was a torture, such as the Etruscan pirates are said to have practised on their captives, whom they bound face to face with corpses and let them die. It has already been mentioned that in the case of Pliny, in whose opinion no mortal was happy and shortness of life was the greatest boon nature had granted to man, the feeling of unhappiness increased to a positive longing for annihilation, and that death appeared to him the best gift of nature. Seneca also, who delights in describing the wretchedness of life in ever varying aspects, praises death as the greatest benefit. Life is absolutely lamentable; it resembles a city taken by assault; it is a stormy sea, which surrounds us and often hurls us on the rocks, and its only harbour is death; it is slavery, when the strength to die fails; the 'cruel stress of life' is the chain which fetters us; death alone prevents the fact of our birth from being our greatest punishment. And even if a Marcus Aurelius regarded the evils of life as unreal, yet its blessings were 'vain, transitory and trifling'; life itself was 'a struggle and a passing guest', its duration a mere point, before and behind us an endless abyss that engulfs all. And yet, amidst the eternally flowing current of the past, man should, and could, stand fast as a rock in the sea; if completely untroubled about the world outside, in respectful submission to fate he retires into the stillness of his own reflections, as into a strong citadel; if he remains loyal to the god who dwells there, if he fulfills the demands of nature, conscious of being only a small part of the great whole. If with cheerful calmness he awaits the end, which may come at any moment, whether annihilation or transformation, he gently parts from life, like the ripe fruit, which in its fall utters the praise of nature as its creator and gives thanks to the tree which bore it.

INDEX TO THE COMPLETE WORK

A cubiculo, I. 35
A libellis, I. 52
A rationibus, I. 51
Ab admissione sive admissionales, I. 89
Abascantus, I. 53; II. 212
Ab epistolis, I. 53
Abnormal scenery, I. 384
Abraham worshipped, III. 118
Abonuteichos, II. 299
Abstemiousness, II. 141
Accompaniment, not always following song, II. 340
Acilius Buta, I. 124
Acilius Glabrio, III. 208
Acme, I. 61
Acta diurna, I. 154, 219; II. 23
Acte, I. 62
Actors, II. 112; limitation of fees, II. 113; earnings, II. 113
Adlectio, I. 127
Adoration of emperors, II. 278
Advocati, I. 162
'Aegyptizing', I. 37
Aelian, III. 96
Aelian, III. 98
Aemilia Lepida, I. 109
Aemilius Paullus' triumph depicted, II. 272
Aesculapius, cures by, III. 97
Aesop, the tragedian, II. 140
Aether as abode of blessed, III. 290
Afranius, *comoedia togata Incendium*, II. 95
Africa, well watered, II. 225
African cities, II. 237; Central African travel, I. 325
Afterworld, Ideas of, III. 297; Lucian and Plutarch on popular belief in, III. 299
Agon, Capitoline, II. 120, 124, 352; III. 44; of Minerva, II. 121; *cf.* Stadium
Agones, of Provincial centres, I. 318; musical, III. 32
Agriculture, I. 188
Agrippa, great constructions, II. 261; King of Palestine, II. 306
Aken, I. 321
Alabaster, II. 189
Alba, Duke of, II. 207
Alcántara, II. 250; bridge at, II. 231
Aleatorum conventicula, I. 219
Alexander of Abonuteichos, III. 131; of Cotyacum, I. 67; Severus, his simplicity of life, II. 149.
Alexandria, I. 355; pilgrimages to, I. 361
Alexandrian period model for Roman art II. 316; products, I. 314
Almonds, II. 167
Altinum, I. 335
Alupka, II. 199
Amber necklaces, II. 183
Ambubaiae, II. 345
Amoenitas, I. 391
Amphithearte, Flavian, II. 72 ff
Amygdalum, II. 167
Androclus, II. 47
Ancient art, II. 266; music, II. 337 ff
Animals, rare, source of, II. 66; at games, hunted, fought or exhibited, II. 69–70 140
Anio, the, lined with villas, I. 335
An-si, I. 308
An-ti, King, I. 308
Antistia Priscilla, I. 54
Antium, I. 331
Anthropomorphism, III. 120, ff
Antinous, worship of, III. 118
Antioch, II. 239
Antipater of Sidon, III. 10
Antoninus Pius, III. 96
Antonio del Pollojuolo, II. 176
Apelles, the, Tragedian, II. 114
Apamea, II. 239, 242
Aphrodisias, II. 242
Apollinaris Sidonius, II. 235
Apollodorus of Damascus, II. 324
Apollonius, Stoic tutor of Marcus Aurelius, I. 67
Apollonius, III. 264
Apollonius of Tyana worshipped, III. 118
Apollonius of Tyana, I. 41; III. 122
Apparitores, I. 190
Apuleius, III. 81, 92, 153, 240
Aqueducts in Africa, II. 225
Aquileia, II. 234, 335
Archaism in antiquity, III. 5
Archiatri, I. 169
Architecture, I. 155; II. 186; 234, 324
Ardeliones, I. 212
Arelate, II. 235
Aristides, I. 4; II. 233; at Athens, I. 341; opinions, II. 292, 338; III. 79, 99, 235, 241
Aristobulus, II. 134
Armatura, II. 56

Arruntius, I. 68
Arruntius Stella, III. 60, 73
Arsinoë, II. 239
Art in statuary, II. 302
Artemidorus, I. 185; III. 136 ff
Artemidorus, III. 95
Artichokes, II. 170
Artistes, whence drawn, I. 319
Artistic relics, I. 378 ff; feeling, II. 325
Artists, largely slaves, II. 318; profession despised, II. 321; tours, I. 318
Ashbridge Park, II. 198
Asiatic music, II. 345
Asiaticus, I. 41; II. 47
Asinius Pollio, III. 29, 30
Asinius Pollio, III. 38
Asparagus, II. 442
Aspendus, II. 244
Assiforanea, II. 53
Astrology, I. 185
Atellanae, II. 48, 90 ff
Athenodorus of Tarsus, I. 83
Athens, I. 391; II. 246; rejuvenated by Hadrian, II. 258; afterflush, I. 34
Athletes, II. 126 ff
Attalus, III. 249
Attila, II. 268
Auctorati, II. 53
Augustales, II. 296
Augustus, III. 29, 136
Augustan literature, III. 21 ff, 82
Aulus Pudens, III. 60
Aurelius Charmus, I. 319
Aurelii Symmachi, I. 113, 329
Aurelius Zoticus, I. 45
Avignon, II. 235

Babylonian bagpipe, II. 345
Bacchanalic process, the, III. 189
Baden, I. 321
Baiae, I. 336 ff
Balconies forbidden, I. 6
Baltic commerce, I. 309
Barbarous religions despised, III. 107, 111
Barbel for 5,000 sesterces, II. 152
Barth, Heinrich, II. 217
Bartolommeo Scuppi, II. 158
Bath, II. 247
Baths and bathing-resorts, I. 45, 321; II. 226 ff
Bathyllus the actor, II. 100, 116, 355
Belgrade, II. 248
Betel nut oil, price of, II. 179
Benedetto Salutati, II. 156, 176
Bestiarii, II. 56, 63
Biblical rites, I. 378
Bignonia Catalpa, II. 201
Birds, taming of, I. 154; II. 70
Birthday ceremonies, I. 211; III. 310
Bithynian cities, II. 250
Boar-Larding, Sir, I. 159
Bologna, great fire at, II. 255
Bona dea, III. 141, 146
Book-trade and prices, III. 36–37
Bordeaux, II. 236
Bostra, II. 240
Brigandage, I. 294 ff
Birtannicus, II. 358
Brotherhood of man a Christian idea, III 221
Bulla, as token of liberty, III. 13
Bull-fights, II. 51, 71, 80
Burdigala, II. 236
Byssus, II. 173
Byzantium, II. 245

Caecilius Claudius Isidorus, II. 213
Caelatura, II. 206
Caenis, I. 62
Callistus, I. 44, 45; II. 135; III. 207
Calpurnius Siculus, III. 53
Calvisius Sabinus, III. 3
Calvisius Taurus, III. 249, 257
Cambacérès, II. 153
Canius Rufus, III. 67
Cannebae, II. 233
Canticae, II. 338 ff
Canus, II. 342, 357
Canopus, I. 361
Capitolinus, I. 85
Capri, I. 334
Capucinades, II. 143
Caracalla's improvements of Rome, I. 8
Carbasus, II. 173
Cardui, II. 170
Carinus, I. 61
Carnations, II. 201
Carnuntum, II. 247
Carruca dormitoria, I. 288
Cartagena mines, II. 206
Carthage, II. 238
Cassius Dio, II. 199, 293; III. 136, 224
Cato, II. 167
Catullus' influence on style, III. 70 ff
Celebrative Art, II. 272
Celsus, I. 91; III. 123
Cenae publicae, II. 296
Centumcellae, I. 330
Centuriones primipilares, I. 139
Cetronius' building mania, II. 199
Chaeremon, III. 238
Charicles, I. 68, 84
Chariot-races, II. 21, 37 ff
Charon and *obol*, III. 298
Cherries, Chestnuts, II. 167
Chigi, Agostino, II. 157
Children's games, etc., I. 229
Choricius, II. 93
Choruses, II. 359
Christian churches, opinions and converts, I. 307; II. 120, 171, 198, 311; III. 118, 198, 200 ff
Christianity, III. 205, 211, 220
Christianity and women, I. 257; III. 195
Christians, hostility to, III. 188 ff
Christina of Sweden, II. 177
Chrysogonus, II. 349
Cicero as proconsul, II. 287; his villas, I. 329; on musicians, II. 358; as purchaser of statuary, II. 263
Cinerary urns, II. 212
Cinnamon, price of, II. 129
Circus, the, II. 19 ff
Cirta, statuary at, II. 263
Cisiarii, I. 279
Cithara, III. 111; II. 341 ff

Citharists, fees of, I. 155; popularity of, II. 351
Citharoedus, II. 362
Cities out of camps, II. 232
Cities, number of, II. 234 ff
Citrons, II. 168
Civic obligations, II. 229–30
Civica Barbarus, III. 249
Claque, II. 115, 357, 363; III. 41 ff
Clarissimi, I. 109
Claudius Agathemerus, III. 256
Cleander, II. 254
Clientela, I. 195 ff
Clothing, luxurious, II. 173
Coactor Argentarius, I. 155
Coarmio, II. 56
Cohors amicorum, I. 75
Coin, legal, I. 304
Colchester, II. 246, 307
Colonies, microcosms of Rome, II. 240
Colours in the Circus, II. 28 ff
Columella, I. 131, 188; II. 168
Comedy, II. 95 ff
Comites, as title, I. 74
Commodus and gladiators, II. 50
Commerce, Chinese, I. 307, 309; Roman, I. 305, 312
Concerts, II. 347
Connoisseurs of pictures, II. 331
Consiliarii Augusti, I. 71
Consulate, length of, I. 127
Controversiae, III. 13 ff
Conventus Matronarum, I. 239
Convictores, I. 82; II. 56; III. 264
Convivia Publica, I. 93
Cookery, II. 153 ff
Coponius the sculptor, II. 322
Corinth, I. 342; II. 246
Cornutus, III. 286
Cornelius Gallus, I. 79
Cornelius Rufus, I. 207
Costunius Rufinus, II. 325
Cotyaeum, II. 253
Craftsmen, immunity from rates, II. 268
Cremona, II. 234
Crescens the charioteer, II. 23, 51; III. 247
Crinagoras of Mitzlene, I. 25
Crispinus and scents, II. 184
Crito, I. 68
Crocuses, II. 167
Curator Statuarum, II. 301
Curatores operum, II. 249
Curia Athletarum, II. 126
Currency, I. 304, 307, 316
Cydamus, I. 325
Cynics, III. 343, 271 ff
Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, III. 204; on *agones*, II. 121
Cyprus, I. 349
Cythesis, III. 24
Cytisus, II. 167

Dacian cities, II. 248
Damascus, II. 240
Dea Dia, III. 156
Declamations, III. 12
Decorative art, II. 260 ff
Dei Manes, III. 308
Delatores, I. 221
Delos, I. 344
Delphi, III. 129
Demetrius, I. 68; III. 273
Demonax, III. 273–4, 277
Demons, belief in, III. 90 ff, 302
Dialogues, Greek-Latin, I. 149
Didius Julianus, I. 65
Didymus Areus, I. 82
Dilettanti in literature, III. 26–27
Dinner-topics, I. 224
Dio of Prusa, II. 252, 336; III. 240
Diocles the charioteer, II. 22, 37
Diocletian's tariff, I. 315
Dionysius of Halicarnassus, II. 332; III. 215
Dioscorus, III. 197
Directoire dress, I. 249
Domina, title of, I. 240
Domini factionum, II. 27
Domitian, III. 43; as patron of literature, III. 33; banishes philosophers, III. 226; his statues demolished, II. 280
Domitius Tullus' park of statuary, II. 264–5
Doryphorus, I. 44
Dramatic companies, I. 319
Dream-oracles, III. 134 ff, 164
Dress, I. 249; II. 174
Drusus Libo, I. 94

Eclectus, I. 59
Editores, II. 53
Education, ancient object of, III. 1; spread of, III. 20
Egregius, I. 141
Egypt, trade with, etc., I. 349 ff
Egyptian Conservatism, II. 304; corn at Rome, I. 25 ff; deities worshipped, III. 104 ff
Elagabalus, II. 361; anecdote of, II. 139
Elba, ironworks at, I. 315
Eleusis, the, at Conopus, I. 361
Embassies, I. 299
Emetics, II. 153
Eminentissimus, I. 141
Emperors as patrons, III. 43
Emperor's portraits, II. 276, 283–4
Emperor worship, III. 117, 119, 187
Empire united by roads, I. 268 ff
Empresses' rank, I. 87 ff
Ems, I. 34
Ennius in fashion, III. 7
Engineering works, II. 256 ff
English estates, II. 197
Entrance-fee to city honours, II. 250 ff
Epaphroditus, I. 40, 44, 65, 82
Ephesus, II. 242
Epictetus, III. 95, 127, 144, 207, 220, 237, 243, 253, 268, 274
Epicureanism, III. 87, 97, 220, 286
Epidaurus, I. 343
Epidemics at Rome, I. 27
Eprius Mercellus, I. 122
Espionage, I. 221 ff
Ethicae, III. 18
Ethics the end of Philosophy, III. 255

Etna ascended, I. 393
Etruscus, I. 45, 51
Eucrates, III. 303
Eudemus, III. 249
Euphrates, III. 227, 268
Euphrates the freedman, I. 51
Eurhythmus, I. 42
Eusebius, I. 35
Eutropius, I. 35
Exploration slight in antiquity, I. 323

Fabullus, II. 323
Factions, growth of, II. 28 ff
Factories of statues, II. 307
Fashion at Rome, I. 30 ff
Favorinus, I. 84; III. 80, 249, 259
Feasts and Festivals, I. 320; II. 121, 149
Feralia, III. 302
Figs acclimatized, II. 167
Fires in provinces, II. 255
Firmicus Maternus, I. 185–6, 237, 339; II. 122
Fiume, II. 235
Flavia Domitilla, I. 63
Flowers in ancient Rome, II. 201
Flutes, II. 341, 344
Foods acclimatized, II. 165
Forks, II. 143
Foucquet, II. 152
Frater as title, I. 74
Fratres Arvales, III. 156
Freaks, I. 367 ff
Freedmen, I. 37, 47 ff, 202 ff
Freedom of speech, III. 28 ff
French cookery, II. 159 ff
French estates, II. 197
Fronto, I. 68; II. 294, 361; III. 7, 56, 80, 139, 233
Fumi, I. 44
Funeral guilds, I. 151
Funerals, II. 210, 213, 217
Fundanus, III. 249
Furniture, II. 269

Gabba, I. 85
Gaius Lutorius Priscus, III. 54
Gaius Thoranius, I. 99
Gaius Stertinius, I. 69
Galba, dream of, III. 165
Galen, I. 68, 78, 170, 173; II. 125, 171; III. 135, 208, 219, 249, 291; his correspondence, I. 303; his philosophy, III. 95; on athletes, II. 127
Games, II. 1 ff, 121
Gardens, I. 418 ff
Gellius, III. 7, 21, 80, 94, 237, 249–50, 257–9
Genii, belief in, III. 114
Gerasa, II. 241
German cookery, II. 161 ff
Germanicus, I. 345 ff, III, 30
Gesta Romanorum, III. 16 ff
Ghosts, belief in, III; 306 ff
Ghouls-in-waiting, I. 215
Gifts at banquets, II. 151; for disasters to cities, II. 255 ff
Gladiators, II. 17, 41 ff, 52–3, 57, 59 ff as soldiers, II. 58; combats at funerals, II. 214; prospects of, II. 49; women as, II. 50
Glass, how used, II. 191
Gnaeus Claudius Severus, III. 227
God's acres, II. 215
Gods not originators of moral law, III. 215; offerings to, III. 165
Gold-plate, II. 205 ff
Gordian I. III. 250
Grammarians' fees, I. 160
Greece decadent, I. 340; disapproved *venationes*, II. 84
Greek Anti-Semitism, III. 183; cities plundered, II. 261; enthusiasm for plastic art, II. 335 ff; philosophy, III. 222 ff.; pre-eminence in rhetoric, III. 77–8; statuary abundant, II. 262
Gregarii, II. 53
Grottoes visited, I. 381, 383
Guilds of tradesfolk, I. 146 ff
Gulliver on tea, II. 147
Gymnasia, II. 123 ff

Hadrian, admirer of sophists, III. 78; architectural works, II. 257 ff; Mausoleum, II. 218; piety, III. 96; verse, III. 34; villa, II. 196, 265
Hadrianopolis, II. 257
Hadrianotherae, II. 257
Hamilton, Lady, II. 103
Hanno's voyages, I. 324
Haruspices, I. 187; III. 126 ff
Haunted house, III. 305
Helicon, I. 57
Helius, I. 40
Helvidius Priscus, III. 223 ff
Henry II of England, anecdote of, II. 140
Herculaneum, Villa at, II. 264
Hermogenes, I. 68
Herodes Atticus, I. 67–8; II. 253, 259, 296; III. 75, 80
Herod's games in honour of Augustus, III. 9
Heroes, Relics of the, I. 372
Hero worship, III. 115 ff, 142 ff
Hippolytus, III. 199 ff
Historical relics, I. 371, 375
Histrio, II. 109
Holinshed on stoves, II. 144
Hordearii, II. 56
Hormus, I. 41
Hortensius Hortalus, I. 123
Hospitium adventorium, I. 291
House-decorators' wages, II. 267 ff
Human sacrifices to clay ghosts, III. 306
Hylas flogged, II. 111
Hymnologi, II. 350

Iced food invented, II. 142
Icelus, I. 41, 47
Igel monument of Secundinii, II. 216
Ilion, I. 346
Illumination, II. 13
Images of gods, III. 164 ff; worship of, 167–70
Immortality of soul, III. 283 ff

Imperial household, I. 66; license for new buildings, II. 249 ff; palaces, II. 191; panegyrics, III. 51 ff
Incantation of dead, III. 307–9
Incense, kinds of, II. 211
Indian commercial relations, I. 306
Inns, absence of, I. 289; as places of ill-resort; I. 293; signs of, I. 291 ff
Insignia, I. 127 ff
Irenaeus, III. 206
Isaeus the sophist, III. 79
Isthmus cut by Hadrian, II. 258
Italian coast with its villas, I. 390

Jewellery extravagance in, II. 180 ff
Jews' aversion to Statuary, II. 305; dispersion of, III. 171 ff; in Alexandria, III. 176; in England, III. 181; in Gaul, III. 180; in Italy, III. 178; revolts of, III. 177; Roman strictures on, III. 184; Treatment by Emperors, III. 182 ff
Joachim I of Brandenburg, II. 140
Josephus on scenery, I. 389
Journeys, I. 287 ff, 311
Judaism among the women, I. 287; neutral, III. 171
Julian on Pantomimes, II. 106
Julius Cæsar, II. 152; games, II. 41
Julius Canus, III. 261
Jumentarii, I. 279
Junius Mauricus, I. 81
Junius Rusticus, II. 294; III. 227
Jurisconsulti, I. 165
Jurists under Empire, I. 122
Juvenal's description of a garret-home, II. 269

Knighthood, offices incident to, I. 137 ff
Knights, I. 134 ff; wealth of, I. 143
Kostolacz, II. 248
Kublai Khan, II. 174

Laberii, villa of, II. 259
Lactantius, III. 194, 215, 311
Lambessa, II. 232; III. 112
Lanistae, II. 53
Lanuvium, II. 251
Laodicea, II. 242; industries of, I. 315
Larcius Macedo, I. 99
Largess at *ludi*, II. 14 ff
Larvae, III. 302, 304
Lateranus, I. 47
Latin, decay of, III. 20; rapid spread of language and literature, III. 23
Laudiceni, III. 41
Legacies for games, II. 10
Lemures, III. 302
Leo X, Pope, II. 157
Licinius Archias, III. 10
Licinius Sura, III. 305
Lilies, II. 167
Literary popularities, changes in, III. 7 ff
Local cults, III. 146 ff; of Greece, III. 158 ff; of Italy, III. 157 ff
Lollia Paulina, II. 182
Longianus, II. 290
Lorenzo de Medici, II. 176
Lotus, II. 168
Lucan, III. 10, 32; Orpheus, III. 11 out of fashion, III. 7; read at school, III. 4
Lucian's *Dream*, II. 310; jibes at polytheism, III. 108; in Pantomime, II. 104, 107; on philosophers, III. 234; his Philopseudes, III. 301 ff
Lucius Afranius, II. 110
Lucius Arruntius, I. 213
Lucius Crassus, house of, II. 185
Lucius Seianus, II. 13
Lucius Valerius Proculus, I. 138 ff
Lucius Verus, II. 145
Lucretius and Epicurean school, III. 86
Lucrezia Borgia, II. 176
Lucullus, II. 151
Ludi, II. 1 ff; religious ceremony, II. 36; times of, II. 11; when held, II. 9
Luxury, II. 131; affected by climate, II. 141; as progress, II. 143; domestic, II. 202; in dress in Germany, II. 177; in Germany, II. 133; in scents, II. 184; of a Nero abnormal, II. 132; of Spanish grandees, II. 144; since 1850 increased, II. 131; under Khalifs, II. 155
Lyons, II. 235; great fire at, II. 255
Lyre, II. 341

Maecenas, III. 30, 224: as Patron, III. 55
Madeira discovered, I. 324
Magic, belief in, I. 260; tales of, III. 17
Maiestas, III. 187
Makaritai, III. 286
Manilius, his Astrology, I. 211; on Pantomimes, II. 103, 110
Manilius Cornutus, I. 172
Mansiones Saliorum, III. 155
Marble, whence drawn, II. 190 ff
Marcelli statues of in Sicily, II. 287
Marcus Aemilius Lepidus, obsequies of, II. 41
Marcus Aemilius Scaurus' theatre, II. 133
Marcus Aquilius Regulus, III. 60
Marcus Aurelius Musaeus, II. 353
Marcus Aurelius, III. 96, 107, 136, 140, 207, 233; and philosophers, III. 240
Marcus Fulvius Nobilior, II. 62, 117
Marcus Lollius, II. 182
Marcus Scaurus, II. 118
Marine, the, I. 189
Marriage, I. 228 ff; an emancipation, I. 236; betrothals by parents, I. 234; bridal ceremonies, I. 235; remarriages of women, I. 243; sumptuary laws in marriage, I. 235
Martial, I. 58 ff, 99, 145; III. 62
Marius Celsus, I. 81
Martyrs, numbers of, III. 193
Maternus the brigand, I. 296
Mausolea, II. 215
Mavortius Lollianus, I. 186
Maxims of Tyre, III. 95, 153; his philosophy, III. 93
Medica, II. 167
Medical quacks, I. 183; superstition, I. 180, 184; wealth, I. 68

Meeting-places in streets replaced newspaper, I. 209, 217 ff
Melitene, II. 243
Melones, II. 168
Melopepones, II. 168
Memnon, statue of, I. 304
Memphis, I. 362
Menageries, imperial, II. 68
Menecles, II. 353
Menecrates, II. 355
Merchants, Roman, their origin, I. 313
Mérida, bridge at, II. 231
Mesochorus, III. 41
Mesoalina, I. 59, 62, 94
Messalla, III. 29 ff, 59; picture of his victory, II. 271
Meursius in luxury, II. 131
Milan, I. 273; II. 234
Militia equestris, I. 136
Mimes, II. 90 ff
Miracles, Pagan, III. 97 ff; the King's touch, III. 122 ff; of Aesculapius, III. 138 ff; of Christianity, III. 196
Missionary enterprise of Christianity, III. 186
Mitylene, I. 344
Mnester, I. 59; II. 114
Mœsian cities, II. 248
Montagu, Lady Wortley, II. 161
Montanists, III. 192
Mont Toux, III. 151
Monumental Art, II. 271
Morality of music, II. 348
Moschus, I. 41
Mountain scenery disliked, I. 391 ff
Mucianus, III. 225, 230
Muliones perpetuarii, I. 288
Mundus, opening of the, III. 302
Municipal patriotism, II. 251
Murrha, II. 202, 203
Music, II. 337; at banquets, II. 350; attempted to depict action, II. 343; ecclesiastical, II. 364; fees, II. 354 ff; male and female instruments, II. 342; no distinction between sacred and profane, II. 350; orchestral, II. 345; part-singing unknown, II. 340; St. Jerome on secular and Christian, II. 364, ff; schools, II. 357; spread of among Romans, II. 361–2
Musonius Rufus, III. 223, 243, 247, 256, 261 270, 278, 280
Mythology and religion, III. 215 ff

Naples, I. 333; before eruption of Vesuvius, I. 334
Napoleon, busts of, II. 284
Narcissus, I. 47; II. 135
Narcissus the Athlete, II. 125
Native cults, III. 112; 146 ff
Nature, ancient feeling for, I. 421, 424
Nature, the Romantic in, I. 395 ff
Naumachiae, the, II. 74 ff
Nemausus, II. 235
Nero, as professional musician, II. 362; as rhetor and poet, III. 31; as tragedian, his favourite parts, II. 99
Nerva, III. 60; as poet, III. 33
Nicanor, I. 83
Nicetes of Smyrna, II. 252
Nicopolis, II. 246
Nicon, II. 144
Nile, source of the, I. 326
Nomenclatores, II. 220
Noricum, II. 247
Novels anticipated by *controversiae*, III. 16
Nux Caloa, II. 167

October Equus, III. 156
Offerings to gods, III. 165 ff
Officials travelling billeted, I. 290
Officinae, II. 308
Olives acclimatized, II. 167; spread of, II. 171
Omens, III. 126
Oracles, III. 129
Orange, II. 235
Oriental cults, effect of admission of, III. 102–103
Origen, III. 193–4, 203, 288
Original sin, III. 219
Orpheus worshipped, III. 118
Orphic mysteries and doctrines, III. 287 ff, 294
Ostia, I. 331
Otho, I. 108
Outspokenness at *ludi*, etc., II. 6–7
Oyster-beds, II. 165

Paganism, its persecution and survival, III. 210 ff
Pagi, II. 232
Painting, Italian artists, II. 322; more honoured than statuary, II. 323
Palanquius, I. 288
Palfurius Sura, III. 239
Pallas, I. 44, 47, 51; II. 135
Palmyra, II. 240
Pammenes, I. 185
Pamphylian cities, II. 243
Panaetius, III. 286
Pannonia settled, II. 247
Panthea of Smyrna, I. 63
Pantomimes, II. 60, 345; and infamy, II. 111; Hylas, II. 105; morality of, II. 106; owned by families, II. 107; restrictions on, II. 117; themes of, II. 101, 103
Paper of Alexandria, I. 314
Paradoxonicae, II. 128
Parentalia, III. 302
Parenzo, II. 235
Paris, the Pantomime, II. 114 ff; III. 49
Parthenius, I. 41, 47; III. 73; and Sigerus, I. 57
Parthian Commerce, I. 308
Patronage of poets, III. 56 ff
Pausilypon, I. 333
Peach-almonds, II. 168
Peacocks acclimatized, II. 165
Pearls, II. 181; in modern Europe, II. 182 ff
Periêgêtai, I. 373
Peregrinus Proteus, III. 275 ff
Perfectissimus, I. 141

Perga, II. 243
Pergamus, II. 242; temple at, II. 325
Persecutions of Christians, III. 190 ff
Pessimism, Greek and Roman, III. 312–3
Petrus de Crescentiis on Gardens, I. 424
Pharos, I. 352
Philippopolis, II. 241
Philosophi, II. 308
Philosophers and pupils, III. 256, 258 ff; as consolers, III. 261; attached to a family, III. 262; attached to court, III. 263; lectures at Rome, III. 249; mostly Greeks, III. 247; quarrels, III. 241; wealth, III. 235
Philosophy, advocates of, III. 245; as unpractical, III. 223 ff; breaking barriers, III. 279 ff; course of study in, III. 250 ff; in vogue, III. 227 ff
Philostorgia not Roman, I. 225
Phonaskos, II. 353
Phrygia thinly populated, II. 243
Physicians, I. 168 ff
Physics, III. 254
Pictorial begging-letters, II. 273
Picture galleries, II. 329
Pictures as legal evidence, II. 273; of old masters, II. 330 ff; of tyrants destroyed, II. 275 ff
Pilgrimages, I. 321; III. 130
Pisidian cities, II. 243
Piso as lyrist, II. 361; as patron, III. 57
Piso Caesoninus and aedile games, II. 44
Plague under Tiberius, I. 168
Plastic art, II. 267
Plate, gold and silver, II. 205 ff
Platonism and immortality, III. 287 ff
Pliny the Elder, I. 139; against popular belief, III. 88; on actors, II. 113; on gluttony, II. 165; on snow as refrigerator, II. 142–3; on Trajan's accession, III. 227; on the protesters, III. 42 ff
Pliny the Younger, I. 30, 31, 42, 72, 89, 95, 115, 199, 209, 232, 235; II. 44, 128, 214, 249, 252, 281, 324; III. 71, 224, 257, 305; and Como, II. 252; his properties, II. 193; his villa, I. 331; on Isaeus, III. 79; on plundering of provinces, I. 121.
Plums, II. 167
Plutarch on applause in a philosopher's school, III. 270; on art, II. 334; on artists, II. 321; on demons, III. 91; on polytheism, III. 109
Poetical improvisation, III. 10; prose, III. 19
Poetry always sung, II. 338; decline of, III. 34; Greek and Latin competitions, II. 120; much read, III. 25 ff; in education, III. 1; introduction to eloquence, III. 2; not profitable, III. 47
Poets' first attempts, III. 10; life, accounts of, III. 48–49; not immune like teachers, III. 47; read in schools, III. 3
Polemo, III. 78; his pomp in travelling, I. 288
Pollius Felix, III. 67, 73
Polycletus, I. 40, 42
Polyphthongon, II. 342
Polytheism, III. 104
Pomegranates, II. 167
Pompey's villas, I. 329
Pompilius Vopiscus, I. 101
Pons Aelius, II. 257
Pont du Gard, II. 231
Poppæa's funeral, II. 212; retiune, I. 288
Porticus Xysti, I. 169
Portraits, Authors', II. 277
Posides, I. 45
Potamophylacia of Nice, III. 176
Potteries of Greek Islands, I. 315
Praecones, I. 154, 191–2
Praefectus arcendis latronibus, I. 294
Praetorian regiment, I. 193
Prayer, efficacy of, III. 444 ff
Ptolemy's Geography, I. 307
Ptolemy Mennaeus, II. 134
Pragmatici, I. 162, 166–7
Priesthood, I. 141
Procurators for married women, I. 237
Procuratores castrenses, I. 50
Proceres, I. 71
Proletariate of Rome, II. 2
Propertius Celer, I. 123
Provincials and Roman honours, I. 100 ff
Prunus avium, II. 167
Public libraries, III. 38
Publius Decimius Eros Merula, I. 173
Publius Egnatius Celer, I. 201
Publilius of Syria, III. 11
Publius Servilius Rullus, II. 153
Publius Sulpicius Quirinius, I. 109
Pueri eminentes, I. 82
Purple wool, cost of, II. 175
Puteoli, I. 333
Pylades, I. 59; II. 100 ff, 346
Pyres, II. 212
Pyrrhic dance, II. 108

Quadratarii, II. 308
Quaestorship, I. 126
Quintilian, I. 158, 161, 251; III. 291; on false philosophers, III. 237; on oratorical *débutant*, III. 40; on rhetorrcal courses, III. 11; on the philosophie, III. 223; his religion, III. 87.
Quintus Catulus, II. 185
Quintus Haterius, I. 213
Quintus Metellus Macedonicus, I. 1
Quintus Metellus Pius, II. 151
Quintus Pedius, II. 323
Quintus Servilius Cæpio, II. 134
Quintus Sextius, III. 247
Quintus Sextius Niger, I. 142
Quintus Stertinius, I. 68

Rabirius, II. 324
Race-horses, where bred, II. 25
Ravenna, II. 234
Reading, III. 38
Receptions, I. 207 ff
Recitationes, III. 36, 39 ff, 48, 67
Redae, I. 279
Rederijkerskamers, III. 44
Refrigerium of saints, III. 290

Regulus, I. 122; his properties, II. 193
Religion, evidence of, III. 84; in second century, III. 94; stability of, III. 101 ff; utility of, III. 85
Religious art, II. 298 ff
Religio loci, I. 383
Remainders of books sent to provinces, III. 24
Rents at Rome, II. 185
Resurrection, ideas of, III. 294 ff
Reversionary speculators, I. 212
Rheims, II. 232
Rhetoric, effect on style, III. 18; exercises in, III. 12; importance of, III. 2; in poetical form, III. 18; professorships of, III. 2
Rhetorician's travels, I. 317; fees, I. 157, 161 ff; periodeutai, I. 318
Rhodes, I. 345; II. 362
Richard II of England, II. 156
Rimini, bridge at, II. 231
Roads, African, I. 275; Alpine, I. 273; Stephen Heinrich on Roman, I. 268; system of Roman, I. 271
Roma as goddess, III. 117
Roman colonies, scheme of, II. 247; copying of Greek works, II. 326; interest in art, II. 328, 333 ff; love of rusticity, I. 384; music eclipsed by Greek, II. 337; nabobs, II. 134; nobles and their estates, II. 200; ritual, III. 155–7; simplicity of living, II. 146; spread of luxury, II. 147; world poorer, II. 221 ff
Rome, her garrison, I. 19; her police force, I. 20; her water-supply, I. 11
Roses acclimatized, II. 167
Rothschild, II. 170, 198
Rubellius Plautus, III. 261
Russian cookery, II. 162

Sacrifices as Thanksgivings, III. 162 ff
St. Augustine, II. 79; III. 311
St. Chrysostom on music, II. 363
St. Rémy mausoleum, II. 216
Sallust on luxurious villas, II. 194; on music, II. 359
Salutatio publica sive promiscua, I. 87
Salvidienus Rufus, I. 29, 107
Sambuca, II. 342, 345
Sta Maria in Capitole at Cologne, II. 249
Saoteros, I. 58
Sarcophagi, costly, II. 212
Sarmentus, I. 85, 143
Saserna, II. 171
Scabellum, II. 346
Scents, II. 184 ff; at funerals, II. 211
Scepticism, III. 87
Scorpus the charioteer, II. 22
Scribonius Largus, I. 168, 178
Sculptors mostly Greeks, II. 322
Sculptuary in the Quarries, II. 307–8
Sculpture, II. 311 ff
Scyllacium, I. 335
Secretariate, the, I. 53
Selge, II. 244
Semi-circular sofas, I. 211
Senators as money-lenders, I. 119; wealth of, I. 113, 122 ff; families, fate of, I. 109 ff
Senatorship, degradation from, I. 133
Seneca, I. 83, 119, 208; III. 5, 32, 144, 216, 220, 264; and St. Paul, III. 209; making a poor man's journey, I. 287; on artists, II. 321; on astrology, I. 69; on Claudius, I. 39; on ostentation, II. 152–3; on philosophy, III. 245–6; on politics, III. 228; on ill-built houses, I. 21; on travelling, I. 381, 383
Sensual music, II. 349
Sergius Julius Frontinus, I. 332
Seven Wonders, the, I. 367
Seviri, I. 350
Sextus Vistilius, I. 80
Shalots, II. 168
Sicily, I. 339 ff
Sidon, II. 240
Sierra Leone, I. 324
Sigerus, I. 41
Sigilla, II. 270
Silius Halicus, I. 333; III. 60, 67
Silk, value of, II. 179
Sillyon, II. 244
Silver-plate, II. 205; as capital, II. 208; extensively used, II. 210
Sirmium, II. 248
Site values, II. 193
Slaves, II. 218 ff; as memory-guarders, III. 3
Smyrna, I. 348; II. 242, 252
Soldiers, I. 301–2
Sophistic influences, III. 74, 76
Spartacus, II. 55
Staberius, II. 214
Stadium, II. 117 ff
State-port, I. 278, 280
Stationes, I. 291
Statius, I. 61; II. 194; III. 60 ff
Statuary, ancient wealth in, II. 300; of divine figures, II. 299; to the dead, II. 296
Statues as honours, II. 289 ff; as marks of gratitude, II. 295; in Rome, II. 301, 307; of celebrated men, II. 286, 290; price of, II. 319
Ships, great size of, I. 351
Stoicism, III. 90, 220, 230; doctrine of immortality of soul, III. 286; popular at Rome, III. 248
Stoics suspected, III. 225
Strabo, I. 327; II. 66
Stratonicea, II. 242
Strenae, I. 87
Stucco relief, II. 266
Styles in statuary, II. 303
Suasoriae, III. 12, 17
Suicide, III. 221
Syllogisms, captious, III. 252
Symmachus, II. 33, 59
Symphoniaci, II. 345
Synthesis, II. 175
Syrians as bankers, I. 313; as merchants, III. 111; at Rome, I. 36
Syringe, II. 201

Tacitus, II. 150; III. 223; his religion, III. 87; on art, II. 334; on luxury, II. 145
Talleyrand, II. 163
Tarraco, II. 237
Tarragona funeral monument, II. 217
Ta-Tsin, I. 308; II. 179
Tempe, Vale of, I. 387
Temple at Tolosa, II. 134
Temples, building of, III. 161; visited, I. 368 ff
Terentius Prisaus, III. 249
Tertullian, III. 218
Thallus the charioteer, II. 24
Theagenes, III. 249
Theatre, severance of song and dance, II. 98
Theatrical music, II. 347, 351
Thebes, I. 363
Theodoras of Gadara, I. 67
Theodoretus, III. 214
Thessalonica, II. 245
Thrasea, II. 359; III. 225, 261
Thrasyllus, I. 84
Tiberius, III. 30
Tiberius Optatus Elipertius, II. 165
Tigellius, I. 83; II. 353, 356
Timotheus the citharist, II. 343
Titinius Capito, I. 55
Titus, II. 358; III. 33
Titus Castricius, III. 258
Titus Flaminius, II. 41
Titus Labienus, III. 28
Titus Petronius, III. 261
Toga as sign of advocate, I. 163
Tokharistan, I. 308
Toll-keepers, I. 293
Tomb-stones, decoration of, II. 270–1
Touring, Roman interest in, I. 368
Tragedy, II. 97; and comedy, II. 338; costumes, II. 99
Tragoedi, II. 351
Trajan no poet, III. 33; not honoured as a god, III. 96; the Forum of, II. 261
Transformation of statues in subject, II. 313
Travel for culture, I. 316
Travelling inside Empire, I. 328
Travertine stone, II. 185
Trebizond (Trapezus), II. 243
Trees venerated, I. 382
Trieste, II. 235
Trigonon, II. 345
Trimalchio, II. 332, 361; III. 115; his tomb, II. 274
Troy, I. 346 ff
Tubae, II. 342
Tulips, II. 201
Tullus and Lucanus as tile manufacturers, I. 120
Tunica molesta, II. 73
Twelve Tables, the, on Funeral Pomp, II. 210
Tyre, II. 240

Ulpian on philosopher's fees, III. 237
Umbonius Silio, I. 133
Ummidia Quadratilla, I. 106
Ummilius Quadratus, I. 64
Unctores, II. 56

Valerius Asiaticus, I. 101
Valerius Homullus, I. 77
Varro, I. 229; II. 167; on art, II. 327; on luxury, II. 147 ff; on music, II. 358
Vedius Pollio, I. 99, 103, 143, 333
Velleius Paterculus, III. 23
Venationes, II. 62; decline and spread of, II. 81 ff; sumptuary laws against, II. 82
Venetian luxury, II. 196
Verecunda, II. 232, 251
Verginius Flavus, I. 161
Verginius Rufus, I. 209, 330
Verrius Flaccus, I. 67, 81
Verulamium (St. Alban's), II. 246
Vespasian as patron of literature, III. 33
Vestal Virgins allowed in stadium, II. 119
Vestricius Spuriana, III. 73
Via Aemilia, I. 273
Via Appia, I. 270
Via Egnatia, I. 271
Via Flaminia, I. 272
Vibius Crispus, I. 122
Vienne, II. 235
Vigiles, I. 169
Vigintiviratus, I. 126
Villeggiature in Italy, I. 329 ff
Villas in provinces, II. 259–60
Vindobona (Vienna), II. 247
Vines, II. 166, 171
Virgil as book of divination, III. 25; Eclogues, success of, III. 24; influence on style, III. 69 ff; read at school, II. 4; reward for sixth book of Aeneid, III. 53
Viroconium (Wroxeter), II. 246
Vitellius as *gourmet*, II. 148
Vitruvius, II. 324; on architecture, II. 187; on quarries near Tarquinii, II. 262
Vocal music, II. 347
Vopiscuo, II. 22, 195, 329; III. 67
Votive tablets, II. 299
Voyages for health, I. 321; how made and length of, I. 283 ff

Walcheren, III. 146
Walnuts acclimatized, II. 167
Wall-paintings, II. 267
Wealth, deterrent causes of, II. 139; in modern Europe, II. 136; obligations of, II. 228; of antiquity, II. 135; under Khalifs, II. 135
William of Malmesbury, II. 144
Windisch, II. 237
Woburn Abbey, II. 197
Women, ambitions of, I. 250 ff; as artists, II. 323 ff; as gladiators, II. 50 ff; as musicians, II. 359; cruelty of, to slaves, I. 244; education of, I. 230 ff; emancipated, I. 249; in nursery, I. 228; morality of, I. 241; passion for theatre, I. 245–6; superstitions, I. 255 ff; virtues of, I. 261; mistresses in their own homes, I. 236

Wrecking, practice of, I. 282
Wroxeter *v.* Viroconium, II. 246
Würtemberg, II. 247

Xanten, II. 233
Xystarchus, II. 126

Yorkshire, inscription in, I. 146

Zabulon, II. 240
Zenodorus, II. 315, 320
Zosimus on Pantomimes, II. 107

DATE DUE

AUG 1 1943

OCT - 4 A.M.

JUL 2 9 1946

MAY 6 1947

AUG 9 '52

AG 1 0 '56

MAY 2 2 '59

FEB 20 1968

FEB 26 1969

FEB 3 1970

FEB 17 1970

FEB 17 1971

SEP 6 1985

DOMINICAN COLLEGE
LIBRARY
SAN RAFAEL

DOMINICAN COLLEGE LIBRARY
DG78 .F82 v.3
Friedlèander/Roman life and manners und
3 3645 00082703 3

DOMINICAN COLLEGE
LIBRARY
SAN RAFAEL
23883

883

DG78 .F7413 1908
vol.3
Friedlaender, Ludwig,
1824-1909.
Roman life and manners under
the early empire

Dominican College Library
San Rafael, California